THE

ANTI-JACOBIN

Review and Magazine,

&c. &c. &c.

For MAY, 1805.

Accuſatores eſſe in Re publicâ utile eſt, ita Criticos in Re literariâ, ut metu contineatur audacia.—ANON.

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

The Prophetic or Anticipated Hiſtory of the Church of Rome, written and publiſhed ſix Hundred Years before the riſe of that Church. In which the prophetic Figures and Allegories are literally explained; and her Tricks, Frauds, Blaſphemies, and dreadful Perſecutions of the Church of Chriſt, are foretold and deſcribed. Prefaced by an Addreſs dedicatory, expoſtulatory, and critical, to the Rev. MR. WHITAKER, *Dean of Canterbury. To which are added,* 1. *A Pill for the Infidel and Atheiſt; in which the divine Authority of the Apocalypſe is logically and philoſophically proved.* 2. *A Word to the Editors of the Goſpel Magazine and Theological Review.* 3. *The Errors and miſrepreſentations of Biſhop Sherlock, in his Diſcourſes on the Prophecies, detected and refuted.* By Joſeph Galloway Eſq. Author of Brief Commentaries upon the Revelation &c. 8vo. PP. 233. 5s. Weſt, Jones, Higham, Jordan and Maxwell, Pearmain and Ridgway, London; and Blackburn, Knightſbridge. 1805.

IT has been obſerved, we forget by whom, that it is no mean proof of genius to write a good advertiſement, or to manufacture a good title-page; and the obſervation, though apparently jocular, is really founded in truth. For both theſe ſpecies of compoſition, though generally ſhort, and ſeemingly ſimple, require, in order to their perfect execution, the power of juſt and accurate thinking, together with a talent for diſcrimination, arrangement, and compreſſion. On the enormous length of the preſent title-page we ſhall make no remarks; but it contains a blunder of a ſingular kind, which we cannot help noticing, and for which we find ourſelves unable to account. Our readers will obſerve that it ſtyles Mr. Whitaker, the learned author of "A general

and connected View of the Prophecies relating to the times of the Goſpel" *Dean of Canterbury*. Mr. Whitaker, we believe, is as deſerving as any man of being a Dean or even a Biſhop. But the fact is that he is only a Rector; and accordingly, in the title of our author's addreſs to him, he is rightly deſigned "rector of St. Mildred's Canterbury."

In our review of Mr. Galloway's "Commentaries" (Vol XVII. Pp. 225 &c. 394 &c.) though we could not rate his ſucceſs as an interpreter of the difficult book of the Apocalypſe very high, we gave him full and unlimited credit for excellent principles and laudable intentions. We felt, indeed, for him all the reſpect which we muſt ever entertain for a good man, who endeavours, with all his ability, to promote the cauſe of religion, of virtue, and of ſocial order. But, from the publication now before us, we have reaſon to ſuſpect that, had Mr. G. lived to read over our Review, we, inſtead of receiving thanks for our praiſe, ſhould have ſmarted ſeverely, under his laſh, on account of our cenſures. For, before his death, our worthy old friend appears to have become extremely irritable. This volume diſplays, in various places, eſpecially in the addreſs to Mr. Whitaker, a ſpirit of bitterneſs towards thoſe who differ from him which we cannot, by any means, approve, and a harſhneſs of language which borders on rudeneſs.

"You will perhaps," he ſays to Mr. W. "think this a ſtrange kind of dedication .... It is intended chiefly to expoſtulate with you upon the uncivil, and I muſt call it unchriſtian-like cenſure, [which] you have paſſed on a work, evidently deſigned, whatever may be the ſucceſs, to promote the truths of the Goſpel of Chriſt."

It appears from this addreſs, that Mr. G.'s "Commentaries" were publiſhed in march, 1802, and that a ſecond edition as we ſuppoſe of Mr. W.'s "View" (which we have not ſeen,) was publiſhed in the month of July following. From this circumſtance Mr. G. concludes that Mr. W. had ſeen his Commentaries, and that they are particularly alluded to in a paſſage of Mr. W.'s preface, which paſſage it is proper that we ſhould give as it is quoted by Mr. G.

"At the ſame time, the *conſtancy* with which it (the Church of Rome) is holden up as the great perſecutor of God's witneſſes even to the laſt, will convince him (the reader,) that the *notion* lately taken up of the appearance of Antichriſt under different characters, is not only an *error*, but one *highly pernicious* in its conſequences, in drawing *the attention of Chriſtians* from a quarter (the Church of Rome) on which they ſhould ever keep the ſtricteſt guard."

This unfortunate ſentence excited in our author ſuch high reſentment that he writes as follows: "This long ſentence is replete with ſo much equivocal and ſophiſtical froth, that it is impoſſible to find out the ſubſtance. If there be nothing in it to wonder at, its abſurdity will create a ſmile." (P. vii.) To us, we muſt confeſs, his ſenſibility appears to be exceſſive, and his reſentment unreaſonable. With Mr. Whitaker's opinions on the ſubject of Antichriſt, though ſupported,

ſupported, as they are, (we ſpeak of his firſt publication) with great learning and ingenuity, we are far from being prepared to coincide. But it was not, we apprehend, to be expected that, thinking as he did, he ſhould ſpeak of thoſe who differed from him in any other terms; and if his language is ſtrong, it muſt, at leaſt be allowed to be that of a gentleman. Beſides, the animoſity of our author ſeems altogether unjuſtifiable, on another account. "It is," he ſays "*a reaſonable concluſion* that I am one, if not the principal, of the culprits [whom] you have diſingenuouſly, and without ceremony, condemned." Now we, for our part, can ſee not even the ſhadow of a reaſon for this concluſion. Mr. G. could not poſſibly have been ignorant (indeed, he afterwards clearly ſhews that he was not ignorant,) that he was far from being the only perſon who had maintained that the deſignation of Antichriſt is, without ſufficient warrant, appropriated to the Church of Rome. And he does not alledge that either his name or his book, in particular, is ſo much as hinted at by Mr. Whitaker.

He proceeds, however, to comment on the ſentence quoted above with a ſeverity which certainly ſavours of rancour, and, ſeemingly, we are ſorry to add, of diſingenuity. To what other principle can we impute the following and ſimilar cavils? "this, Sir, is really the firſt time I have ever heard or read that *conſtancy* in maintaining a doctrine is the proper ground of mental conviction. Perſons who have been acquainted with what has paſſed in the world, have known that the moſt miſchievous doctrines, as well as evident truths, have been with great *conſtancy* and perſeverance held up from age to age, and yet the former have been believed and the latter rejected." (P. viii.) We cannot take upon us preciſely to ſay, and that for the reaſon already aſſigned, what Mr. W's. particular meaning is, when he talks of the "*conſtancy*" with which the doctrine that the Church of Rome is Antichriſt is holden up. He probably, however, means *the conſtancy, with which*, as he ſuppoſes, *that doctrine is holden up in ſcripture*. But Mr. W. we are ſure, was incapable of affirming as a general propoſition, what Mr. G. in this place makes him affirm, *that, the conſtancy with which opinions are maintained is a certain evidence of their truth*. This perverſion, therefore, of Mr. W's. ſenſe aroſe, we are afraid, from a voluntary miſconſtruction.

Our author, however, has better ſucceſs when he contends that Mr. Whitaker's opinion *has not* been the general belief of the Church. "All the ancient fathers," he ſays, "who have mentioned the ſubject, ſuch as Irenæus, Cyril, Jerome, Auſtin, &c. &c. have from the evident meaning of the prophecies of Daniel and St. John, referred the æra of the riſe of Antichriſt to 'the latter times,' 'and the laſt time' of the Goſpel of Chriſt; and you will not, ſurely, inſiſt that the Church of Rome, whoſe power and influence commenced in the beginning of the ſeventh, and has continued twelve centuries ſince, aroſe in the 'laſt time or latter times' of the Chriſtian diſpenſation. (P. xi.) And, Sir, in reſpect to the opinions of the later divines, I ſuſpect you will find it a difficult taſk to produce any of them, who aſcribed to the

Church of Rome the character of Antichriſt, before the latter end o the tenth, and the begining of the eleventh century, 400 years after her riſe." (P. x.) In the 12th. century indeed, the opinion gained ground. It was adopted by the Albigenſes and Waldenſes, as well as by Wickliffe and his followers. But, although it was ſupported by many of the firſt Reformers, yet, even in England the birth-place of Wickliffe, till we come to the times of the houſe of Stuart, it was, as Biſhop Newton confeſſes, by no means faſhionable. "It may," ſays this learned Prelate, "ſurprize any one that ſo little was ſaid upon the ſubject in the long controverſies concerning Popery in the reigns of Charles and James the ſecond." Warburton afterwards, which has often ſurpriſed us, founded a lecture to promote its diſſemination. But even this inſtitution has not had the effect of rendering the notion popular among the Engliſh divines.

Our author having beaten, as he himſelf imagines, Mr. Whitaker from this ground, with much vehemence urges his own idea, that Antichriſt is revolutionary France. He has not, he ſays, been ſparing in expoſing the unchriſtian practices of the Church of Rome. But "what then," he aſks "do you mean to ſay? is it that no other enemy of the Church of Chriſt is, or ſhall, come to try the faith and obedience of the Chriſtian world to the revealed word of God, during her militant ſtate upon earth!" This it muſt be confeſſed is well put; and he then, with the uſual rough boldneſs of his pencil, draws a picture of that "MONSTROUS SYSTEM OF ATHEISM" which was eſtabliſhed, by the revolutioniſts, in France, and which, he inſiſts, is much better entitled to the appellation of Antichriſt than the Church of Rome.

But he will not treat Mr. W's. book as Mr. W. has treated his; that is, he will not condemn it without diſcuſſion and examination. Mr. W. indeed, he ſays, "has given us little new, except that jumble of wild and eccentric notions—that 'the Turkiſh empire is to fall to open the way according to the new doctrine of indemnities, for an exchange with the Pope for the City of Rome;' that 'the ſeat of the Papal Church is to be removed to Jeruſalem;' that 'the Pope is to triumph for a time in Jeruſalem;' and that the day of vengeance is to be locally in Judea." It muſt be acknowledged that ſome of theſe notions appear to us abundantly fanciful. But Mr. G. does not ſtop to comment on them. He proceeds to ſome of thoſe which Mr. W. entertains of prophecies which all acknowledge to be already fulfilled.

The firſt is that relating to the *two witneſſes*, by whom Mr. W. underſtands "*all* the true worſhippers of God, and eſpecially the preachers of his pure word." But Mr. G. placing much reliance on the word *two*, contends, as formerly, for theſe witneſſes being *the old and new teſtaments*. His arguments, however, are moſt extraordinary. He quotes Jo. v. 34. "But I receive not teſtimony from man," which he thus explains: "I depend not ſolely nor principally upon the evidence of man, *not upon that of the prophets, nor of the apoſtles*, nor of the preachers of the word of God; nor even upon John, in whom

whom for a time ye believed: *for there have been false prophets*, and there will be false apostles and false preachers." (P. xviii.) But that there have been false prophets and apostles is plainly no reason why our Saviour should not appeal to the testimony of the true. The fact is that he did appeal to it, and accordingly our author immediately after urges that appeal in confirmation of his opinion. "The blessed Son of God enjoins them to search *the Scriptures*, as those superior and infallible witnesses. (Jo. v. 39.)" We must give our Saviour's words, as Mr. G. has given them, together with his comment. "Search the (two) Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are THEY which testify of me." The comment is incomparable. "Taking the words *they*, twice repeated, as they are clearly expressed, the sentence means nothing short of this—that the *two Scriptures* are *they*, or those *two* witnesses which testify of me." (P. xix.) Was our author ignorant that the plural number may be applied to more *objects than two*? or that there are *more Scriptures* than two in the old Testament.

He is, however, aware he says, of an objection which may be urged by the cavilling unbeliever, namely that Christ could not mean, in his life time, to refer to *the new Testament*, which did not then exist. "But such objection," he adds "could never enter into the mind of a Christian." We trust that we are Christians, and not cavilling unbelievers. Yet to us the objection appears insurmountable. How could Jesus, in order to convince the Jews, refer them to Scriptures which were not then written, and whose authority, if they had been written, the Jews would have rejected? But, says our author, "Christ had *two witnesses* at the time he made that Revelation" to St. John. And "hence," he argues, "it was not only natural, but indispensibly necessary, when *in his life time* he was teaching all future generations the way to everlasting life through faith in him, *as well as at the time of the Revelation to St. John*, to refer to both parts of that evidence by which that faith was to be established." (P. xxi.)

This, certainly is, to say the least of it, a very "lame and impotent conclusion." But, what will not fail to astonish the reader, Mr. G. himself, in a subsequent tract, the last in the volume, *expressly contradicts it*. He is treating again of our Saviour's words (Jo. v. 39.) "Search the Scriptures," "It may here," he says, "be asked what did Christ mean by the *Scriptures?* The answer is, *he could mean nothing but the prophecies of the old Testament. The doctrines of the new Testament were not in existence, or then composed:* and it is only the prophetic part of the old in which the Jews placed their hope of eternal life, and which foretells or treats of Christ and his offices." (P. 108.) The idea, however, that by the *two witnesses* are to be understood the old and new Testaments is supported by some general reasoning which we really think to be *sui generis*, and of which the following is an ample specimen.

"I imagine you will not deny that the spirit of prophesy must have represented future events, to the minds of the prophets, in a manner conformable

formable to their ideas of things, and the terms fixed on by mankind to convey them. For otherwiſe neither the prophets themſelves, nor mankind could underſtand them. Nor will you contend that John did not underſtand the Revelation when made to him. Now Chriſt, who made the Revelation, having occaſion, in the courſe of it, to point out certain unerring and infallible teſtimonials of himſelf and his miſſion, refers, and expreſſly limits their number, unto *two*: 'And I will give power to my *two* witneſſes.' The prophet underſtood the number in the ſame limited ſenſe, and in that identical ſenſe records them for the uſe of mankind. And mankind, by their univerſal agreement, have affixed to the word *two*, a certain definite meaning, *which is one added to or conjoined with one*; *as in Engliſh, two*; *Latin, duo*; *French, deux*; *&c.* But you, Sir, and the learned commentators whom you have followed, in the teeth of that agreement of the plain meaning of the prophet, and the infallible authority of Chriſt himſelf, have perverted and tortured the plain *definite* meaning of the word *two* into an *indefinite* one, into indefinite millions, and in that ſenſe applied it to '*all* the true worſhippers of God and preachers of his pure word.' By what authority or licence you have taken this preſumptuous liberty, of thus expounding the word of God according to your arbitrary notions, it is impoſſible to conceive. It would, however, be well in you to conſider, that ſhould you perſiſt in affixing your own arbitrary ideas to terms, and ſhould others follow the example, the terms compoſing human languages may be thrown into greater confuſion of tongues than they were at the building of the tower of Babel; and the pure and holy word of God perverted into a blaſphemous jargon." (Pp. xxi, xxii.)

Mr. G. next attacks Mr. W.'s ideas of the *man child* (Rev. xii. 5.) brought forth by the *woman*, and afterwards "caught up unto God and to his throne." Mr. W. follows the general train of the commentators, who ſuppoſe this man child to ſignify Conſtantine the great. Mr. G. repeats and preſſes, on this ſubject, all his former unintelligible reveries (See Anti-Jac. Rev. Vol. XVII. Pp. 235, 237.) "You contend," he ſays, "with your predeceſſors, that Conſtantine the great is the *man child* referred to in the text, brought forth by *the woman*, or Church; but you do not explain how the Church brought him forth, *as a woman brings forth a child out of her body*; nor how a '*man child*' applies to him at the time of his *birth*, more than to any other child or man ever yet born; nor how, nor when, nor where, he 'ruled over *all nations* with a rod of iron." (P. xxvii.) It is obvious that by *all nations* is meant the Roman empire, which was commonly enough called *the world*, and even *all the world* (St. Luke ii. 1.) The reſt of this paſſage is ſo extravagant as to deſerve no obſervation. But our author, who makes the *man child* mean the *word of God*, inſiſts that Mr. W. degrades the ſubject by "reducing" (as he expreſſes it) "the word of God, and the MAJESTY of his power, to a level with thoſe of *a man*" (P. xxvii.) He farther complains that Mr. W.'s ſcheme is unſatisfactory in another reſpect. "You have not," he ſays explained the ſimilitude of a man's being 'caught up to God,' to his becoming the ſole emperor of a temporal ſtate; nor the reſemblance of the throne of the moſt high God, which is in heaven,

heaven, and whence he eternally manifeſts his wiſdom, power, and moſt excellent glory, to the temporal ſeat (for Rome, being a republic, had no throne) of the ſupreme power of a man." (P. xxviii.) This parentheſis of our author rather ſurprized us. What! was Rome a republic, and without a throne when the Apocalypſe was written, or in the time of Conſtantine? If our readers ſhould be at a loſs to conceive how *the word of God was caught up to his throne*, we cannot, we freely acknowledge, aſſiſt them: for we have no conception of it ourſelves. But we ſhall lay before them Mr. G.'s explanation. If they ſhould not comprehend it the fault is not ours.

"Let us, however, inquire whether a little common ſenſe, aided by Scripture, will not help us to the true interpretation of the figurative expreſſion 'caught up unto God and to his throne.' In common language and common ſenſe, by a man *taking up* a child or a thing, we underſtand that he takes it under his care, to his boſom, to his more eſpecial protection. And, when we ſearch the Scriptures, we find that God and his throne are in heaven; in his boundleſs, immenſe, and ſpiritual heaven. There Chriſt commands us to pray to 'our father which *art* [is] in heaven.' And God himſelf declares that 'the heaven is *my* [his] *throne* and the earth *my* [his] footſtool.' And we read that 'the Lord took up Elijah to heaven in a whirlwind,' from the *threatened deſtruction of Jezebel* [deſtruction threatened by Jezebel]: meaning under his divine and ſpiritual protection: and that Jeſus Chriſt, after his dreadful crucifixion and death, was taken up into heaven, 'to ſit at the right hand of the throne of God': that is, under the eſpecial and eternal protection of his Father. And in the text under our conſideration, the man child was to be caught up *unto God and his throne, to his throne itſelf, becauſe, we are told, 'the word was God.' It was his truth,* IT WAS OF HIS DIVINE ESSENCE, IT WAS HIMSELF. It emanated from him through his ever bleſſed Son, and therefore, he would not ſuffer it to be hurt or impaired, during the temporary wilderneſs ſtate of the Church, that he might in his own appointed time return it to her." (Pp. xxix, xxx.)

Of this we think nothing at all is to be made. Mr. W. it ſeems, has quoted in juſtification of his notion, 1 Chron. xxix. 23. where it is ſaid that "Solomon ſat on *the throne of the Lord*, as king inſtead of David his father." But our author contends that this expreſſion is not analogous to that in the Revelation. It means only, he ſays, "that Solomon ſat upon the throne of his father David, *given of the Lord to him.*" Granted; but why may not the phraſe in the Apocalypſe, in like manner, mean that Conſtantine ſat upon the throne of the Roman empire, *given of God to him*? Mr. G. however, endeavours to fix abſurdity on Mr. W.'s expoſition in as curious an attempt as we have ever ſeen. "In this ſenſe," he ſays, meaning his own ſenſe, "and in no other, I apprehend every judicious reader has ever underſtood the text" in Chronicles, "and none of them ever conceived that David ever ſat *upon the throne of God in heaven*, which your conſtruction ſtrongly implies." (Pp. xxx, xxxi.)

Mr. Whitaker has ſaid that "Solomon in the earlier part of his

glory, was made a type of that perfect character which has since appeared as the true King of Iſrael." Our author denies that any ſuch typical reſemblance is to be found in Scripture. "I have," he ſays, "ſearched for it, and it is not there." Nothing ever ſurpriſed us more than this aſſertion. Not to mention other places of Scripture, the 45th. and 72d. pſalms, of which Solomon was, undoubtedly, the primary ſubject, have, by almoſt all interpreters, both Jewiſh and Chriſtians, been applied to the Meſſiah. Mr. G. however, contends that Solomon could not poſſibly have been a type of Chriſt; and his reaſons amount to this, that their characters were, in many reſpects, not only unlike but oppoſite. He has, accordingly, drawn out a ſtatement of nine particulars, in which they are contraſted. But this mode of arguing diſcovers great defect either of knowledge or of judgment. David was an eminent type of Chriſt, and ſo was Jonah; yet no one ſuppoſes that to the crimes of the one or the diſobedience of the other there was any thing correſpondent in his immaculate character. Indeed if a perfect reſemblance be required, no two things whatever can be ſaid to be like. On this ſubject our worthy author writes with more than common weakneſs. "I would have dwelt longer," he ſays, "on the diſſimilitude, or rather ſtriking contraſt, between your type and your prototype; but the ſerious mind recoils from the compariſon at every ſtep." The ſentence which immediately follows is directly againſt himſelf, and ſhould have ſhewn him the futility of his own argument. "Far be it from us then to *ſeek for any thing like a perfect type of the immaculate Son of the moſt high God, among the frail, fallen, ſinful race of Adam; for we may be aſſured it is not to be found among them.*" We have ſomething, however, yet more extraordinary. "Were it otherwiſe," ſays Mr. G. "there have been many more righteous and perfect characters than Solomon, who yet fall infinitely ſhort of that reſemblance neceſſary to conſtitute a type of our Redeemer; ſuch as Noah, Job, Moſes, Abraham, Iſaac, Jacob, Joſeph, Samuel, &c." (Pp. xl, xli) Was our author perſuaded that none of theſe perſons were types of Chriſt? So, at leaſt, he ſeems to ſay, but on what principle we know not; for that ſeveral of them were ſuch we have the infallible authority of Scripture.

Our author, however, preſſes with conſiderable effect, on Mr. W. the inconſiſtency of confounding the two beaſts deſcribed in the 13th. chapter of the Revelation, by interpreting them both of the Church of Rome. Of that Church, he thinks with Mr. W., the firſt beaſt which "roſe up out of the ſea," the repreſentative. But the ſecond beaſt, which "came up out of the earth," he underſtands, as our readers will remember, of revolutionized France. But though his expoſition is not very convincing, we are inclined to agree with him that the prototypes of theſe two beaſts muſt be different. The ſecond beaſt is expreſsly called "another beaſt," and is inveſted with attributes totally diſtinct from thoſe of the firſt. The following remarks are ſhrewd and well urged, though the concluſion is rather too bitter as well as too confident.

"Were

"Were you to tell us that you ſaw a man of ſuch a deſcription, and then add, *and I ſaw another man*, deſcribing him by marks entirely different; and were we to contend [that] you meant to convey to us an idea of *the ſame* man, and not of *another*, would you not conclude that we were deranged in our underſtandings, or had loſt the meaning univerſally affixed to the word *another?* How then can you expect that mankind can receive a conſtruction ſo contrary to their ſettled ideas? Some apology might be made for your predeceſſors in this 'miſchievous' error, which has thrown the Apocalypſe into great confuſion, as they wrote before the ſecond beaſt had come;' and might incautiouſly conclude [that] no other enemy but the Church of Rome was to come. But for you, who have heard his [i, e, the ſecond beaſt's] ravings and denunciations againſt the Church of Chriſt, and ſeen the dreadful progreſs [which] he has made towards its deſtruction, to be not only ſilent, but the firſt to cenſure with ſeverity all thoſe who have thought it their duty to warn Chriſtians againſt *its* [his, the ſecond beaſt's] ſeduction, no apology can be made." (P. xliv.)

We come now to the author's "prophetic hiſtory of the Church of Rome," which he conſiders as contained in the eleven firſt verſes of the thirteenth chapter of the Revelation. Our readers will remember with what vehemence Mr. G. in his Commentaries, contended that the ſecond beaſt of St. John is not deſcriptive of the Church of Rome. On reading the tract before us, it ſtruck us that he was afraid of the imputation of favouring that Church; and that for the purpoſe, chiefly, of warding off ſuch imputation the tract was compoſed. But, whatever might be the author's motive for writing it, the eſſay itſelf is a poor production, which diſplays neither learning, nor judgment, nor conſiſtency. It conſiſts of a minute, continued, commentary, on the eleven verſes above mentioned. In his introduction to it, Mr. G. obſerves that "hitherto commentators upon the Apocalypſe ſeem to have done more harm to the cauſe of chriſtianity than good." To the truth of the obſervation we moſt readily aſſent; and we are ſorry to add that, in our opinion, the labours of our author on this difficult book will never be conſidered as forming an exception to it. Of the elucidations contained in the diſſertation before us we ſhall proceed to preſent our readers with ſome ſpecimens.

Mr. G. begins with ſome ſingular remarks on the nature of *beaſts*. "A beaſt," he ſays "is an animal whoſe natural properties are ſtrength, cruelty, and a gratification of its luſt." (P. 2.) This is no deſcription of *beaſts* in general. The author, indeed, ſeems to have had *wild beaſts* particularly in his mind; for he immediately adds "ſuch are thoſe of a tyger, a bear, and a lion;" but the "gratification of luſt" is not peculiar to *a beaſt*, not even to a *wild beaſt*. The four great empires, however, he contends, "are deſignated by Daniel 'by four beaſts,' on account of their filthy, and luſtful idolatry, and their bloody and deſtructive wars." It is evidently the *latter* only of theſe two circumſtances which is ſhadowed out by the name of *beaſt*. The name he thinks, is peculiarly applicable to the Church of Rome, which "perfectly," he ſays, "reſembles a beaſt." In proof of this we are favoured with

the

the following ſentence, which is *perfectly* in this author's ſtyle of writing. Hiſtorians "inform us that, beſides her blaſphemous idolatry, expreſsly forbidden by God, and her unrelenting and mercileſs perſecutions of the Church of Chriſt during the long period of eight preceding centuries, ſhe has practiſed and countenanced every kind of crime, and every filthy abomination, ſuch as frauds, magic, ſimony, fornication, adultery, inceſt, ſodomy, aſſaſſinations, poiſoning and murders; and moreover that her Popes, her head and her great Exemplars, her Cardinals, her Prieſts, Monks, Nuns, Friars and Jeſuits, have lived in, and up to theſe abominations." (P. 3.) This picture is greatly overcharged, and altogether unfair. If many bad men and women have lived in the Church of Rome, the ſame has been the caſe in other Churches. And it will not be denied that, in all the claſſes here mentioned of her members, ſhe has produced many excellent and exemplary perſons, who would have done honour to any Church.

The riſing of the beaſt out of *the ſea* is thus explained. "The ſea is a body of water naturally calm and undiſturbed, and therefore, an emblem of many nations in a ſtate of *peace*." (P. 4.) The power foretold muſt, conſequently, riſe when the nations are "calm and at peace." Our author here takes a ſummary view of the ſtate of mankind from the flood to the beginning of the 7th. century, in order to ſhew that, with the exception of two ſhort intervals, 1. from the converſion of Conſtantine to the death of Theodoſius the Great, and 2. from the expulſion of the Oſtrogoths about the middle of the 5th. century to the year 630, the nations were never, during this long period, *in a ſtate of peace*. To the latter interval he aſſigns the riſe of the beaſt, when Phocas was emperor A. D. 606. It is needleſs to examine the truth of a concluſion which is founded in premiſes ſo evidently chimerical. But the "ſummary view" contains ſome notions which deſerve to be mentioned. By the flood our author ſays, "a greater number of the human race was deſtroyed than now inhabits the earth." This we think is altogether improbable; and Mr. G. we are certain, cannot know it to be true. The Poſtdiluvians, he tells us, lived for a while under patriarchal dominion, which they afterwards changed for regal;" "chuſing their kings out of that claſs of men moſt eminent for their piety, virtue, and wiſdom." This origin of kingly government is wholly fanciful and gratuitous. But the following account of the riſe of idolatry is worſe than fanciful. It is groſsly contradictory. Men loſt, in time, "all knowledge of the true God; *and with it all fear of puniſhment for their evil deeds, either here or hereafter*. Yet having," adds our author, "*only ſome confuſed and blind traces of an unknown and inviſible God*, they thought they muſt have thoſe that were viſible, and therefore, they adopted, ſome the celeſtial bodies and made a variety of others with their hands, images of beaſts, fiſh, ſerpents, &c. *taking care that they ſhould be ſuch as were without the ability to puniſh or moleſt them*." (Pp. 5, 6.) But if theſe men had no fear of puniſhment, what had they to do with gods at all? And, eſpecially, how came they to be ſo careful to chuſe ſuch as

as *ſhould not be able* to puniſh them? This, we really think, approaches to nonſenſe as nearly as poſſible.

The beaſt's "ſeven heads and ten horns," are explained, as uſually, to mean the "*ſeven different legiſlative authorities*" or ſeven forms of government of the Roman ſtate, and the "ten executive powers" or ſtates which aroſe in the weſtern part of the empire. But *the beaſt*, we have ſeen, did not, according to our author, appear till 606. This ſuppoſition is neceſſary when the beaſt is to be interpreted the *Church* of Rome. But, now the beaſt is the *ſtate* of Rome, which aroſe more than 2,500 years ago. On this ſubject the author's notions are involved in inextricable confuſion. On verſe 2d. of the chapter, he ſays that the "dragon," who "gave his power to the beaſt, and his ſeat and great authority," is "intended to deſignate Phocas, one of the moſt cruel tyrants and murderers that ever diſgraced the imperial throne." (P. 15) If ſo, and if *the beaſt* denote the Roman ſtate from its commencement, it follows that Phocas "gave his power, and his ſeat and great authority" to Romulus. But even with regard to the "ſeven heads" or forms of legiſlative authority, our author is not conſiſtent. They are here enumerated in the following order: "Kings, Conſuls, Dictators, Decemvirs, Military Tribunes, Emperors, and Popes." (P. 10.) But in p. 16, where they are again enumerated, for *Decemvirs* we have *Triumvirs*. In this caſe our author could not have pleaded either an unintentional miſtake, or an error of the preſs: for *the triumvirate* really conſtituted a diſtinct form of government in Rome. The "ten horns," according to Mr. G. are "England, France, Holland, Germany, Pruſſia, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, Sardinia, and Naples." (P. 11.) It is obſervable that in fixing on the particular ſtates prefigured by the "ten horns," hardly any two of the commentators agree. Our author here repeats the unaccountable whim (See Anti-Jac. Rev. Vol. XVII. p. 407.) that, before the time of Tarquinius Priſcus, idolatry was not the religion of Rome. "For under all her different forms of government, *from the reign of Tarquinius Priſcus*, down to the eccleſiaſtical dominion of the Popes incluſive, ſome kind of blaſphemous idolatry has been propagated and prevailed as the ruling religion of the Roman nation."

We have likewiſe a philoſophical account why *the beaſt* was "like a leopard (v. 2.). It is becauſe "the ground of the leopard's ſkin is of a light yellow colour, a ſhade darker than pure white, mixed alſo with ſpots black as jet." Hence this animal is employed to repreſent "a power which had already faded or fallen from the pure truths of the goſpel into errors; and was from that ſtate to fall into the black blaſphemy of heathen idolatry." (P. 12.) But why were the beaſt's feet "as the feet of *a bear?*" Nothing can be more plain. The bear "with *his* feet, gathers *its* food and ſeizes *its* prey, and when within the graſp of *its* paws, embraces *it* to *his* boſom, and cruſhes *it* to death." (P. 13) This "beautiful figure properly repreſents *the four original clerical orders* of the church of Rome; the orders of Cardinals, Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons; thoſe faithful inſtruments

ever

ever devoted to her will." (Ibid.) It is a little unfortunate for our author's *beautiful figure* that Cardinals *never were* A CLERICAL ORDER

The prophet (v. 3.) ſaw one of the heads of the beaſt "as it were, wounded to death." Many commentators, and Mr. W. among the reſt, refer this to the civil head. But our author refers it to the *Pontifex maximus*, or religious head, which was wounded to death by the converſion of Conſtantine and his ſucceſſors to the goſpel. The "deadly wound, however, was healed," when Pope Boniface, having been made univerſal Biſhop, or High Prieſt, over all the Chriſtian Churches, conſecrated the Pantheon at Rome to the worſhip of the images of the dead martyrs, and ſaints. "Then 'all the world wondered after the beaſt.' Not ſatisfied with embracing Europe, he propagated his idolatry," ſays our author, "in Aſia and Africa, the other two quarters of the world only then known; *and ſince the diſcovery of America, even to its moſt diſtant regions.*" (P. 19.) From this laſt clauſe it appears that, ſince writing the "Commentaries," Mr. G.'s ſentiments had undergone a very conſiderable alteration. (See Anti-Jac. Rev. Vol. XVII. p. 406.)

Our readers, we preſume, will eaſily excuſe us from following Mr. G. with particular exactneſs, through the reſt of this Commentary. But the expoſition of the words, "and all that dwell upon the earth ſhall worſhip him," (v. 8.) furniſhes ſuch a ſpecimen of critical (or, to ſpeak more properly, *nonſenſical)* interpretation as will hardly, we think, be met with twice in a century. It is proper, therefore, that it ſhould remain on record.

"*The earth is a dark body in the natural world, which will not receive, but rejects the light of the ſun,* and therefore is an accurate ſymbol of that ſtate of human darkneſs and degeneracy, that will not receive the light of the revealed love of God." [Mr. G.'s philoſophical tenets, with regard to the earth, remained unaltered to the laſt. See our 17th Vol. Pp. 235; 395.] "St. John uſes it in this ſenſe: 'He that is of the earth is *earthly*;' ſo St. Paul, when ſpeaking of 'the enemies of the croſs of Chriſt, whoſe end is deſtruction, whoſe god is their belly, and whoſe glory is in their ſhame, who mind *earthly things*.' And St. James, when ſpeaking of earthly wiſdom, tells us, 'this wiſdom deſcendeth not from above, but is *earthly, ſenſual, devilish*;' and it is evident from the context, that the phraſe 'them that dwell upon *the earth*,' alludes to *thoſe who lived in that ſtate of ſchismatic degeneracy and darkneſs, which ſo generally prevailed among the profeſſors of Chriſtianity, before and in the beginning of the 7th century, when the church of Rome reared her idolatrous head.* Here the prophet aſſerts that 'them [they] that *dwell,' that* REST OR RELY UPON THOSE FALSE AND MYSTERIOUS DOCTRINES, INCONSISTENT WITH THE DOCTRINES OF CHRIST, *ſhould worſhip the beaſt*.' And what he aſſerts is ſtrictly come to paſs: for it was thoſe profeſſors of Chriſtianity, who had tortured and perverted the true and plain word of God into ſtrange and unintelligible doctrines, to anſwer their *earthly* and ſenſual purpoſes; and who thus prepared, were ready to worſhip the Beaſt, by embracing his idolatry, yet more myſterious, earthly, and ſenſual." (Pp. 38, 39.)

This

This reaſoning puts us ſtrongly in mind of that of the writer who, in jeſt, we ſuppoſe, and in ridicule of ſuch baſeleſs interpretations, finds BUONAPARTE in the number of the Beaſt. (See Vol. XIX. p. 205.) We muſt take leave of this treatiſe after pointing out one other glaring inſtance of our author's inconſiſtency. "There is," he ſays, "the ſtrongeſt of all preſumptive evidence that the Popes of Rome, during many centuries paſt, have been led into the horrid captivity of ATHEISM by Satan himſelf; and that, at leaſt, the generality of them have believed neither in *a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, nor any* GOD *to beſtow and inflict them.*" (P. 46.) And again: "Looking at their actions, *do they not demonſtrate that they have neither believed in a ſtate of future rewards and puniſhments, nor in a God*; but have been led into captivity by 'a ſtrong deluſion,' according to St. Paul, 'that they ſhould believe a lie,' *the lie of Atheiſm,* THAT THERE IS NO GOD." (P. 48.) Suppoſing all this true, who could poſſibly expect what we are going to tranſcribe? "In the days of their authority and influence, they (the Popes) began their myſterious and iniquitous frauds, and have been conſtantly adding to them, age after age, ever ſince, until the apoſtaſy itſelf, ſickened with their blaſphemous preſumptions, have caſt them up, but unfortunately to prepare the ſtomach for *a more deadly draught, the poiſon of French atheiſm.* (P. 49.) It is, ſurely, not unreaſonable to aſk why *French atheiſm* ſhould be *a more deadly draught* than *the atheiſm of the Popes.*

We proceed to take ſome notice of the "Pill for the Atheiſt and Infidel." And, firſt of all we muſt obſerve that here the author, for what reaſon we know not, begins to number his pages anew, which enumeration is, however, regularly continued, through the three remaining treatiſes, to the end of the book. The "Pill" is uſhered in by an Introduction, in the opening of which Mr. G. obſerves as follows: "that the Apocalypſe was written in the end of the firſt century, and that, though its language was then *obſolete*, myſterious, and confeſſedly unintelligible, the Antient Fathers and Elders of the Church, the immediate ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles, received it into their churches, as canonical, and of divine authority, are truths which have been often proved, and never denied." We know not what our author means by ſaying that the language of this book, at the time of its publication, was *obſolete.* But in the third century, he ſays, ſome perſons aroſe who denied its inſpiration, contending that it is "obſcure, unintelligible, and inconſiſtent." This ſlander continued, in ſome degree, till it was overcome, "by the general prevalence of truth, in the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries," which Mr. G. departing widely from the common opinion, calls "thoſe brighter ages of Chriſtianity." During the eight or nine next centuries, the Apocalypſe, as well as the reſt of the Scriptures, were, our author remarks, almoſt forgotten. And when, at the Reformation, the attention of men was excited to ſtudy the ſacred records of truth, Mr. G. complains that this intereſting portion of them was generally neglected. Neither Wickcliffe, nor Luther, nor Calvin attempted to vindicate its authority.

authority. Scaliger praiſed Calvin for not commenting on it; and Whitby confeſſes that he knew not what to make of it. At laſt, Dr. South, "having" as Mr. G. alleges, but with great injuſtice we think, "more wit in his brain than pure religion in his heart, boldly denounced it *as a wicked and miſchievous book.*" We cannot conceive Mr. G. correct when he aſcribes this language to Dr. South. This divine, however, he ſays, "has been followed by all the tribes of Deiſts, Infidels, and Atheiſts, ever ſince; thoſe lordly renegadoes" [we do not perceive the propriety of the epithet] "that ſtyle themſelves MONTHLY REVIEWERS included." "In many inſtances, theſe hypocrites have ſhewn the cloven foot." This, he ſays, has been lately proved by "the pious authors" of a publication of which we muſt confeſs that we never heard before, but which, it appears, is intituled "A Review of the Anti Jacobin, Critical, and Monthly Reviews."

Our author mentions a ſermon in which it is aſſerted that the Apocalypſe is "*barbarous* even to *ſolæciſm* in its *ſtyle*, of an *involved* conſtruction, and *loaded* with *dark apparently wild* allegory," together with a Review (he does not tell us what Review) for Feb. 1798, in which this falſe and ſhameful ſlander is declared to be "founded in critical juſtice." He laments that the "ſhepherds of Iſrael, the ſhepherds of the Church of England, ſit in ſilence, with half cloſed eyes and folded arms, without liſping out an accent to recal their flocks from wandering into the wilderneſs of this miſchievous error." (P. x.) There is, however, one late exception, he owns, to this general charge. It is furniſhed by an anonymous pamphlet, printed for Hatchard, 1802, and intituled "The Evidence of the Authenticity and Divine Inſpiration of the Apocalypſe ſtated." But this pamphlet examines only the external evidence. It is the object of our author's "Pill for the Atheiſt and Infidel" to diſplay the internal.

In this diſſertation the divine authority of the Apocalypſe is ſaid to be "logically and philoſophically proved." The *logical* part of the proof is contained in three formal ſyllogiſms, of which the two firſt, we think, might have been omitted. They contribute nothing to the force of the argument, and ſerve only to demonſtrate that Mr. G. was ſkilled in metaphyſics. The firſt is thus expreſſed:

> "A knowledge of events, whether paſt, preſent, or to come, is neceſſary to enable a man to deſcribe and communicate right ideas of thoſe events. But ſuch is the limited nature of the intellectual faculties of man, that his knowledge of external objects is confined to things and events which have *previously exiſted*. Therefore it is impoſſible that man can deſcribe and communicate right ideas of events, by the *natural* agency of his intellectual powers." (P. 19.)

The major propoſition, Mr. G. ſays, "requires no demonſtration." Yet a perſon, without being a caviller, might object that it is not ſelf-evident. For a deſcription of events, not yet in exiſtence, may certainly, by divine inſpiration be ſuggeſted to thoſe who do not comprehend what they are made to deſcribe. And, in fact, we have no reaſon

to

to believe that the prophets underſtood the meaning of every prophecy which they uttered. In proof of the minor, Mr. G. enters into an examination of the proceſs by which the mind acquires its knowledge of objects. But this logic ſeems not very correct. "The human mind," he ſays, "perceives nothing of external things until their real archetypes are preſented and impreſſed upon it through the organs of the body." (P. 20.) "But, as it is impoſſible for archetypes of future events, which never exiſted, to be impreſſed upon the human mind, it is evident that it can know nothing of them." (P. 21.) From this principle of our author it evidently follows that paſt events which we have not ſeen are as incapable of being the ſubject of knowledge as future. We know not, indeed, what he means by "the archetypes of events;" but ſuch events are not now in exiſtence any more than future events. And if, as our author ſeems to think, all knowledge of objects muſt be acquired by their being preſented to the mind, and impreſſed upon it, through the organs of the body, it is undeniable that the mind can have no knowledge but of objects preſent. The ſecond ſyllogiſm is conceived in the following terms.

"God, who is infinitely perfect, poſſeſſes the ſupernatural and ſpiritual quality of *preſcience*, or a knowledge of all future events. But that being who poſſeſſes a knowledge of future events can communicate it to other *intellectual* beings, *capable* of receiving it. Therefore God can communicate a knowledge of [future] events to his intellectual creature *man*, who is capable of receiving it." (P. 21.)

In the major of this ſyllogiſm, the word *ſupernatural* is very improperly uſed. A ſupernatural quality is one not naturally inherent in the being poſſeſſed of it, but conferred by ſome ſuperior power. But there is no power ſuperior to God; and therefore all his attributes are natural to him. Of the *truth* of the propoſition our author has attempted a proof, part of which is contained in this ſingular ſentence.

"It is a problem impoſſible to be ſolved by the wit of man, how a God, who has created all things *that have exiſted from all eternity*, who has renovated, *re-created*, and ſuſtained them ever ſince; and who can renovate, *re-create*, and ſuſtain them to all eternity; or annihilate them at his pleaſure; without having inceſſantly and eternally models or images as it were, or rather perfect ideas of them, at one intuitive view before his infinitely comprehenſive mind: and this knowledge of all things, paſt, preſent, and to come; this omniſcience, includes his preſcience, and is one of his peculiar attributes." (P. 22.)

Here the author's argument is, clearly, good, but it is ſtrangely expreſſed. For, 1. The ſentence is groſsly ungrammatical, there being no verb to the nominative God. 2. What Mr. G. means by *re-creating* things, and things, too, *that have exiſted from all eternity*, we are unable to conceive. But we ſhall now tranſcribe his laſt ſyllogiſm, which is of the hypothetical form.

"If man neither has nor can acquire preſcience, or a knowledge of future events, by his own *natural powers*; if *God* alone poſſeſſes ſuch knowledge, and

and can communicate it to man; and if *St. John*, in the Apocalypſe, has foretold many extraordinary events, which were impoſſible to be foreſeen by man, and which have come to paſs in after ages, with all the predicted circumſtances; then it neceſſarily follows that St. John muſt have received his preſcience and his ideas of future events *from God*; and written the Apocalypſe *under divine inſpiration.*" (Pp. 23, 24.)

The two firſt poſitions our author conſiders as ſufficiently proved in the firſt and ſecond ſyllogiſms. The remainder of the eſſay is, therefore, confined to the proof of the third poſition, which ſuppoſes 1. That the Apocalypſe contains a prediction of many extraordinary events, which *were* to come to paſs; and, 2. That many of thoſe events *have actually* come to paſs.

Our author firſt adverts to the kind of *language* in which this and the other prophecies are written. "It is ingeniouſly compoſed of hieroglyphics, ſymbols and allegories, taken from the natural, to repreſent to the mind the things and events of the moral world." It is, he thinks, the moſt correct of all languages. "Each figure has a literal and moral ſenſe annexed to it, and to which it refers with the niceſt accuracy, *and indeed with abſolute certainty.*" We are afraid that this is ſaying rather too much. At leaſt, if what is here ſaid be literally true, it would ſeem that the knowledge of this language is loſt: for otherwiſe we ſhould not obſerve ſuch diſcordance among the interpreters of it. But that it was well underſtood by the antients our author contends from the inſcriptions yet remaining on the Egyptian monuments; from the traces to be found of it in the Oriental poets; and particularly from the hiſtory of the Patriarchs. And here he gives us a very curious paraphraſe on Jacob's interpretation of Joſeph's dream, as recorded in Gen. xxxvii. 9, 10. This paraphraſe, we think, deſerves to be inſerted; for, though, at firſt, it may appear a little ludicrous, it is perfectly juſt.

"The *ſun* is, as it were, the *head*, the enlightener and preſerver of the natural world; and I bear this reſemblance to it: I am the head, the inſtructor and preſerver, under God, of my family, my little world: the ſun is, therefore, an hieroglyphic deviſe of me, in my patriarchal and moral character. The *moon* is a body of the natural world, of leſs importance, and is, as it were, ſubordinate to the ſun, receiving that light from him which ſhe communicates to other bodies under her. My wife is the weaker veſſel, with leſs fortitude, and ſubordinate to me, and from me receives inſtruction reſpecting the management of my houſhold: the *moon* is, therefore, an emblem of her. The *ſtars* are bodies *ſubordinate to the ſun, and attached to him by the laws of attraction and gravitation, and receive their light from him*" [Here our author has, certainly, not made the patriarch a very enlightened philoſopher; but, perhaps, he was, in fact, not much more enlightened, in this reſpect, than he is here repreſented.] "So my children are ſubordinate and attached to mē by conſanguinity and the moral principle, and from me receive light and inſtruction: hence the *eleven ſtars* denote my eleven ſons, excluſive of Joſeph the dreamer." (P. 26.)

Before our author proceeds directly to prove "that many of the events

events foretold in the Apocalypſe *have actually* come to paſs," he thinks it neceſſary "previouſly to conſider what *was* [were] the great deſign and uſe of prophecy; and why it conſiſted with infinite wiſdom to introduce it into *his* two covenants made with man for his redemption." (P. 28.) On the ſubject of God's covenants with man, our author's ideas ſeem very confuſed; or, rather, he ſeems to have had no conſiſtent conception of them at all. He calls the Apocalypſe "a hiſtory of the future judgments of the Father, during the continuance of the *ſecond* covenant, the period of his grace and ſpiritual diſpenſation." (P. 29.) From this it would appear that, according to him, there was no *covenant of grace*, or ſpiritual diſpenſation, till the coming of Chriſt. In p. 43, he talks of "the neceſſity of a *new* Revelation to revive the fear of God in the hardened hearts of ſinful *man*, [men], *during the covenant of grace*; for otherwiſe *he* [they] would be in a more forlorn and wretched ſtate than under *the covenant of works.*" Hence it ſeems to follow that, in Mr. G.'s opinion, till the coming of Chriſt, mankind were under *a covenant of works.* Yet in p. xiii. of his introduction to this tract, he ſays that "the firſt and great prophecy (Gen. iii. 15.) is the ſtock out of which all the prophecies of both Teſtaments grow; and that the commencement of its completion may not improperly be dated from the time [when] God, in the abundance of his mercy and love for his fallen creatures, condeſcended to offer them *terms of ſalvation from mount Sinai.*" But the Moſaic covenant can, with no propriety, be conſidered as containing the firſt offer of terms of ſalvation; nor was it, at all, a diſtinct covenant of Grace. The fact is, that ever ſince the fall of Adam, there has been but ONE covenant of Grace, eſtabliſhed in the mediation of the univerſal Redeemer, and fully made known only in the goſpel. And even this covenant is, in one ſenſe of the words, *a covenant of works*, inaſmuch as good works are indiſpenſible conditions required to entitle mankind to the benefits of it.

After a long and deſultory digreſſion concerning the uſe and intent of prophecy, in which digreſſion are found many moſt fanciful notions, our author comes directly to ſhew that events foretold in the Apocalypſe have literally come to paſs. For this purpoſe he fixes on the ſixth chapter, of ſeveral verſes of which he gives an explanation. His object is to tranſlate the ſymbolical language of the prophet into the language of common life; and to ſhew how exactly the prophecy was fulfilled. Of his ſucceſs in this attempt we ſhall produce ſome ſpecimens; and a few, we are perſuaded, will be thought ſufficient.

The firſt verſe explained by our author is the ſecond of the chapter. This verſe he ſays, under four diſtinct figures, gives us a brief view of the prophet's whole ſubject. The firſt figure is that of *a white horſe.* Now this white horſe means *the true Church of Chriſt.* For (reader attend) "as a horſe is an animal, *powerful, perſevering, uſeful, and eaſily managed*; ſo the true Church of Chriſt is ſo *powerful*, under the ſpirit of its divine ruler, that it is not only to overcome the heathen world, but even the ſecond death." (P. 50.) Our author ſhews how the Church is equally entitled to the epithets of *perſevering and*

uſeful. Again, with regard to the *colour* of the horſe, we are told that, as "white *or light*, comprehends all the orders of colours, ſo *the word of God* in the Church [for now the horſe is not the Church itſelf but the word of God] comprehends the pure order of all truths." In confirmation of this expoſition, our author obſerves that "Chriſt, at his transfiguration, on account of his quickening and purifying ſpirit, is ſaid to have had 'raiment *white* as light.'" And that "the Church of Chriſt, at his reign upon earth, are to follow him upon *white horſes* [that is, if our author's former explanation of the term *horſes* was right, upon *white Churches*] and clothed in fair linen: *white* and *clean* to ſhew the perfection of *the word of God, in which they (his followers) are to be clothed.*" (P. 51.) How theſe examples, however, confirm our author's tranſlation of this figure of *a white horſe*, we do not well comprehend, any more than we comprehend how the followers of Chriſt are *to be clothed with the word of God.*

"In the next ſentence of this verſe," ſays Mr. G. "we read—FIG. 2. —'*And he that ſat upon him (the horſe or Church) had a bow.*" (ibid.) Here the author gives very ſtrange information. "The firſt figure of ſitting upon a horſe *is taken from a king ſitting upon his throne and preſiding over a nation.*" This we, certainly, ſhould never have been able to diſcover. But at all events, "as the mere ſitting upon a throne, or ruling over a nation, is no complete and perfect figure of its great ſtrength and power, inasmuch as there are many weak and petty princes who ſit upon thrones, ſomething more was neceſſary to convey the idea of the great influence and ſtrength of the Church; and therefore, Chriſt is farther repreſented as having a 'Bow,' the proper emblem of great ſtrength and power." (P. 52.)

On the word *ſtars*, in the 13th. verſe of this chapter, Mr. G. obſerves that "a ſtar in the ſingular, is uſed to denote a king, or a great leader of an army, *becauſe their power is derived from ſome higher authority.*" (P59.) From what higher authority, except that of God, is a king's power derived? We are ſure that our loyal author did not think it derived from the people. But his explanation of the word *heaven*, in the ſame verſe is inimitable. "The word *heaven*," he ſays, is often put for the exalted ſtate and glory of any ſyſtem of religion; as for the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Churches, and for the ſyſtem of heathen theology." (P. 60.) Here it is uſed for the latter. "But it is uſed for the former by the prophet Haggai (i. 9, 10.): 'Becauſe of mine houſe that is waſte, and ye run every one to his own houſe, therefore is *the heaven* (the Church) over you ſtayed from dew (or no longer feeds you with inſtruction)". It undoubtedly, required no common degree of perverſe ingenuity thus to torture one of the plaineſt paſſages in the Bible into a myſtical ſenſe. For the prophet thought not of *the Church* or of *inſtruction.* His language is to be literally underſtood of the *natural heaven*, and of *natural dew.*

Of this perverſe inclination in our worthy author for myſtical interpretation we ſhall give, from this tract, but one example more. It is, however, ſuch a one as we have never yet ſeen equalled; and we ſhall be ſomewhat mortified if any of our readers be acquainted with any thing

thing more extravagant and wild. It is part of Mr. G.'s expoſition of the 15th. and 16th. verſes of this chapter, where we are told that "the kings, of the earth, &c. hid themſelves in the dens and rocks of the mountains, and ſaid to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that ſitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the lamb."

"A den or cave," ſays our ingenious commentator, "is a place in which men hide themſelves from danger. Thoſe dens and rocks were the dens and rocks of the *mountains, evidently meaning the twelve apoſtles, and the primitive fathers who lived in the time of the revolution* [from paganiſm], *their ſucceſſors.*" (P. 65.) This, we venture to believe, is ſuch an interpretation as never occurred to the moſt ſagacious of our readers. But our author's ſcheme, they will ſee, required it. For the hidden meaning of the exclamation, "fall on us and hide us," is thus developed.

"At ſo great and miraculous a revolution in the Roman empire, the greateſt of all the empires upon earth, from a Pagan to a Chriſtian power; and at a time when the Chriſtian Church had been reduced to its laſt gaſp, by the numbers and ſeverity of its perſecutions, the prophet repreſents that the heathen party ſhould be convinced of the ſuperiority of the goſpel of Chriſt over their idolatry; and ſhould intreat the elders of the Chriſtian Church to *fall on and hide their idolatrous ſins and pollutions, by inſtructing and converting them to the true goſpel of the Son of God.*" (P. 66.) "Was it not natural for them to implore the elders and rulers of the Church of God; and ſay, 'hide our idolatry and ſins from the power of your God, and from the judgment of his bleſſed Son, *whom* [who] you have often told us was ſent for our inſtruction and redemption; effectually hide us, by inſtructing us in his goſpel, and filling our hearts with a juſt ſenſe of his holy will, that we may utterly forſake our own chimerical gods, and our filthy pollutions, and obey and worſhip him in ſpirit and in truth. For in that caſe, you have often alſo told us, he would pardon our tranſgreſſions, and be reconciled to us. Thus hide us from the power of him that ſitteth upon the throne, and from the dreadful, although righteous judgment of his eternal Son." (Pp 68, 69.)

This is, ſurely, the moſt fanciful of all interpretations, and might eaſily be miſtaken for burleſque. The language is evidently that of men in frantic deſpair, invoking even inanimate things to ſcreen them from that vengeance which they dare not hope to eſcape. Our author converts it into the language of ſupplication founded in penitence and confidence of pardon. We are much afraid that Mr. G's. efforts will not greatly contribute to remove from the Apocalypſe, that obſcurity in which it has been hitherto involved, or cure thoſe prejudices, which former injudicious commentators have excited againſt it: But ſo highly is he ſatisfied with his own ſucceſs, that of the paragraph immediately ſucceeding our laſt quotation the concluſion is conceived in the following terms "We have here, then, the figurative language in which this prophecy was originally written, and I have (perhaps as the Monthly Reviewers, who have long been grinning a ghaſtly ſmile

at the Revelation, will ſay, preſumptuouſly and with full aſſurance; but, as I truſt, the pious and honeſt critical reader will ſay, with that awful regard which is ever due to divine truth,) endeavoured to tranſlate it into its literal Engliſh dreſs. And thus the candid reader has both the original and the tranſlation before him."(P. 69.)

The fourth treatiſe in this volume conſiſts of a moſt violent philippic againſt the editors of a publication called "the Goſpel Magazine and Theological Review." Of the character of that publication we know nothing but what we learn from Mr. Galloway. And we muſt ſay that, from his own repreſentation of the caſe, the puniſhment appears to us to be out of all proportion to the magnitude of the offence. Theſe writers, in reviewing Mr. G's. commentaries had ſaid that "they could not bring themſelves to think with the author;" and that "the worthy writer of the above commentaries had evidently his prejudices." This we do conceive, was a way ſufficiently mild and reſpectful of expreſſing their diſſent. Yet it hurt the irritable feelings of our author to ſuch a degree that he writes as follows.

"A cenſure more ſevere upon the author, and injurious to the ſale of the work, the cunning of malice itſelf could not have invented except a wilful and wicked perverſion of truth. Nor could it be more artfully and inſidiouſly applied: for, while you confeſs that the author is both an '*ingenious* and *worthy* writer' and conſequently has written with acuteneſs and merit; yet you ſay, he 'has evidently his prejudices': that is to ſay, in plain Engliſh, that he is a capable and qualified writer, and yet he is incapable and unqualified.... For prejudices and truth, however they may be aſſimilated *in the wild and licentious ideas of modern reviewers*, are ſo different in their nature, that they can never proceed from the ſame ſtock, nor grow in the ſame ſoil nor flow from the ſame pen. Men do not read to be deceived; *nor are books (Reviews excepted,) written to miſlead.* And thus, from various ſiniſter motives—1. artfully to conceal your own ignorance of the ſubject; 2. to avoid any candid examination of the truths [which] I had advanced; and 3. inſidiouſly to ſteal upon and prepare the mind of the reader for more groſs and direct abuſe of the work; you, like the ſatyr in the fable, *blow hot and cold out of the ſame mouth*; you *applaud* and *condemn, condemn* and *applaud*, the author and his work *in the ſame ſentence.*" (Pp. 92, 93.)

On reading theſe paſſages we could not help ſhuddering at the thought of the caſtigation which we ourſelves muſt have received if the worthy author had been ſpared to peruſe our ſtrictures. He ſeems to have contracted a mortal antipathy to Reviewers and Reviews. He thinks all ſuch publications *written to miſlead.* He points out, however, the duty of Reviewers in very perſpicuous and unqueſtionable terms. "True criticiſm," he ſays, "*is an impartial examination of words and things, and an upright judgment formed upon that inveſtigation.*" He adds that "a perſon fit for the ſacred office of a critic muſt not only poſſeſs *an ingenious*, but an *ingenuous* underſtanding." (P. 88.)

This

This is all very juſt and very fair. But our worthy author afterwards enlarges, we think, the qualifications which he requires in a critic, eſpecially in a theological critic, to a moſt prodigiouſly unreaſonable extent. He chaſtiſes the Reviewers in queſtion as perſons "who have aſſumed, *preſumptuouſly aſſumed*, the ſupreme right of deciding upon all goſpel and theological truths: an office," he adds, "the duty of which *none but thoſe who poſſeſs ſupernatural and apoſtolic light and wiſdom*, can be capable of diſcharging." (P. 91.) This is terrible information, we muſt confeſs, for the whole fraternity of Reviewers, in the preſent times a very numerous body. If the caſe be really as Mr. G. ſtates it, *we* muſt certainly relinquiſh one branch of our employment, which we have always conſidered as of high importance; we mean the reviewing of theological works: for *we* have no pretences to *ſupernatural and apoſtolic light and wiſdom*. We comfort ourſelves, however, with the reflection that, if authors have the grace to ſhew as much modeſty and humility as ourſelves, there will be few theological works to review. The worthy commentator, ſurely, would not have maintained that it is eaſier to *write* a good book than to *review* it; and of courſe, no perſons will hereafter, preſume to publiſh works on theological ſubjects, "but thoſe who poſſeſs ſupernatural and apoſtolic light and wiſdom."

One part, however, of the flagellation which our author beſtows on theſe critics ſeems well deſerved. Mr. G. had expreſſed, like every virtuous man and loyal ſubject, his utter deteſtation of the principles and crimes of the French revolution. The critics on the other hand, employing the common artifice of democratical writers who want courage to ſpeak out, launch forth, by way of contraſt, into declamation againſt the kings of France, particularly Louis XIV. and XV; againſt the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, the *Lettres de Cachet*, "the bigoted conduct of Madame de Maintenon," and "the black maſk," "all of them," ſays Mr. G. with truth, "matters altogether irrelevant and impertinent to the ſubject [which] I had treated of." They then aſk "what man with a ſenſe of real religion, or a grain of feeling for *the natural rights of mankind*, but muſt *execrate* ſuch conduct, whether perpetrated by daring and ſhameleſs men in former times, or by the *more enlightened* philoſophers at the end of the eighteenth century?"

Theſe are, evidently, the words of a jacobinical writer who, by an artful *ſet off* endeavours to divert the mind of the public from the horrors and unexampled crimes of the French revolution. On this conduct of the reviewer our author is, as he ought to be, ſevere; and he makes the following declarations, which are ſo honourable to his principles both religious and political, that, although we have already protracted our obſervations beyond what we intended, we cannot, with juſtice to him, omit them.

"As you have cenſured my want of religion, I will proſtrate myſelf before you, and confeſs my ſins. Know then, that my religion has taught me 'to execrate' or *curſe* nothing; for all things come from God, and

are God's: and therefore, if you ſhould think the *execration* and *curſing* [of] the 'houſe of Bourbon,' and all the kings upon earth, your goſpel-duty, I chearfully leave that pious office to you, to the pope, and the atheiſtical cabal of France, who have long ſince, in that reſpect, anticipated your wiſhes. I love *real* religion, that religion which ariſes from an awful fear of the righteouſneſs and juſtice, and the unfeigned love of God; in that humility of ſpirit, and divine charity and brotherly love, which proceeds from a pure, uncorrupt, and unperverted faith in Chriſt; [This ſentence is ill-conſtructed, and ungrammatical; but the author's meaning is plain.] "And, therefore, I hate all *fanaticiſm*, *ſchiſms*, and wanderings from the plain and pure word of God; all hypocriſy and wilful perverſions of truth. And further, in regard to my want of feeling for the natural rights of mankind, know this alſo that I love TRUE LIBERTY; that liberty, I mean, which is reſtrained by wholeſome laws founded in order, ſubordination, and the eternal fitneſs of things: and therefore, I love that ſubordination and allegiance in the ſervant to the maſter, in the child to the parent, and in a ſubject to every adminiſtrator of the laws, through all the order of magiſtracy, from the conſtable up to the Supreme Power, whether conſiſting of one, a few, or many, whom God, in the courſe of his all-wiſe providence, has been pleaſed to ſ t over me . . . , I abhor and deteſt that liberty, that philoſophy, and the conduct of its authors and all their admirers, whom you, applauding, ſtyle '*more enlightened philoſophers*; more enlightened than the ways of God in the courſe of his ruling in the kingdoms of men, or in permitting the houſe of Bourbon to rule over the French nation, I repeat it again, I hate that *enlightened philoſophy*, which is only another ſofter name for that 'liberty and equality,' that unbounded licentiouſneſs, anarchy, and atheiſm, which are, with gigantic ſtrides, carrying deſolation and ruin over the whole earth."

"In your concluding paragraph," continues our author "you take a brief though confuſed view of the ſtate of France under the *Houſe of Bourbon* at the end of the ſixteenth century, as well as of that under *Robeſpierre* and other revolutionary and atheiſtical philoſophers at the end of the eighteenth. And here your prejudice in favour of, and predilection for, the latter [this is clumſy writing.] are evident from your own words. You labour hard to find expreſſions to deſcribe your hatred to 'the enormous outrages' of the firſt, and you labour yet harder, for it was a more difficult talk, to find words to *ſoften* and *mitigate* the unparallelled deſpotiſm, horrid injuſtice, lawleſs oppreſſion, and the multiplied ſcenes of maſſacres, aſſaſſinations, and bloody murders of the latter philoſophers, who ſurpaſſed, in the courſe of ſeven years, all the acts of deſpotiſm, injuſtice, and cruelty of the former, during the ſpace of fourteen centuries: changing France, from a ſtate of order and peace, into a field of blood, or as an author of the time aſſerts, into 'ONE VAST TOMB.' The firſt in your opinion of them, were '*a ſwarm* (a laboured and inelegant expreſſion to deſcribe a number of ſucceſſive kings,) 'of daring and ſhameleſs men.' The latter you deſcribe as 'MORE ENLIGHTENED PHILOSOPHERS at the end of the eighteenth century.'—Enlightened indeed! by their ſupreme god, Reaſon,! with errors, impiety, and blaſphemy! So enlightened, that treaſon and murder were not criminal, but lawful; yea, ſocial duties! So enlightened, that they denounced the bleſſed Son of God as a wretch to be cruſhed, *an impoſtor!* and taught that men owed [owe] obedience to

no God but human reaſon; for that there *was* [is] *no other God!!!*" (Pp. 96—99.)

The object of the laſt tract contained in this volume is to ſhew that Biſhop Sherlock has miſtaken the meaning of 2 Pet. i. 19. which is the text of his diſcourſes on the uſe and intent of prophecy. Our authors obſervations on this ſubject are, we think, partly right, and partly wrong. He is right in objecting that Sherlock has paſſed over, without a full explanation, the emphatic terms "*a more ſure word*, βεβαιοτερον τον λογον. We conceive too that he is right in the expoſition which he gives of theſe emphatic terms; namely that the evidence of prophecy for the truth of the goſpel is ſuperior even to the evidence of miracles, among which the apoſtle had juſt referred to that of the transfiguration in the mount. That the firſt kind of evidence is the more concluſive of the two ſeems ſufficiently obvious. For though the proof from miracles may be irreſiſtible to thoſe who are witneſſes of them, it is not of equal force to thoſe who know them only from teſtimony; whereas the evidence of prophecy, as has been often obſerved, is A GROWING EVIDENCE, of which the weight accumulates in proportion as it deſcends. But this very conſideration proves Mr. G. wrong in his interpretation of the phraſe, "a light that ſhineth in a dark place." Theſe words are explained by Sherlock, thus: "the time will come, when the thing [which] you hoped for ſhall be placed in *a clear light*, when you ſhall ſee your expectations fully juſtified in the accompliſhment. In the mean while ye do well to attend to prophecy, though a ſmall glimmering light, and ſhining at a diſtance in a dark place; yet the beſt [which] you have, or can have at preſent." But, "how does a light," our author aſks, "ſhine in a *dark* place? Why, in its full luſtre and brightneſs," he anſwers, "ſhewing clearly every object within the ſphere of its radiance, and removing and diſperſing the darkneſs, as it were, in a ſupernatural manner, with which the place was before filled." (P. iii.) This, we think, is a moſt unnatural interpretation, and altogether inconſiſtent with the ſcope of the apoſtle's argument, which was to direct the Church to the gradually increaſing light of prophecy. This light he tells them, was then comparatively dark; but the time would come when its ſplendor would emulate that of the bright day.

But in ſupport of his own opinion Mr. G. has an argument, which is evidently, however, of no ſolidity or ſtrength." "Can it be ſuppoſed," he ſays, "without derogating from the wiſdom, the honour, the juſtice, and love of God for his poor, fallen, miſerable creatures, that he would offer terms of ſalvation, and threaten them with eternal puniſhment if they did not embrace and obey them; and yet, at the ſame time, give them only a glimmering light, a light ſhining in a dark place, at a diſtance from its centre!" (P. 118.) But if this reaſoning be good, it clearly follows that the evidence of prophecy muſt have been as convincing at the beginning as it will be at the end of the world; before its accompliſhment as after. When our author

therefore, aſks," where did Biſhop Sherlock get the idea of 'the time to come,' when the Church ſhould have a better and plainer light of the things 'hoped for,' and when all 'her expectations ſhould be juſtified in the accompliſhment?" the anſwer is obvious. He got it from the very nature of the thing, which neceſſarily implies that, in proportion to the number of prophecies fulfilled, is the evidence of theſe truths which prophecy was intended to eſtabliſh. We ſhall conclude with copying the laſt paragraph of our author's book, which conſiſts of a curious mixture of modeſty with contemptuous and undiſcriminating cenſure. Our author, ſurely knew that *all* Reviewers, whatever may be their other demerits, are not "faithful ſons of the French Encyclopediſts." The indelicacy of the image which cloſes the ſcene we paſs without any animadverſion.

"Upon the peruſal of the preceeding obſervations, and of my brief commentaries upon the Revelation, &c. the well diſpoſed and careful reader will perceive that I have differed, in many inſtances, from former commentators, and, among them from Dr. Newton, a former Lord Biſhop of Briſtol, and Dr. Sherlock, formerly Lord Biſhop of Saliſbury: two divines eminent for their piety as well as learning. On that account, I have only to entreat him to do me the juſtice to believe that I have not done this without a fear and diſtruſt of my own inferior abilities, which cannot boaſt of a liberal and learned education; and that, as the truth, which leads to the peace and comfort of mankind in this world, and to eternal life hereafter, is my only aim, *that* [dele] I cannot receive a higher reward and gratification, than a candid refutation and detection (in the courſe of fair argument and honeſt diſcuſſion,) of any miſtakes [which] I have undeſignedly committed. But as to the cavils and ſophiſtry of Reviewers, thoſe faithful ſons of the French Encyclopediſts, I ſhall treat their diſhoneſt criticiſms and philoſophiſms with the contempt [which] they deſerve, leaving them to wallow in their own *filth*, and to ſubſiſt upon their own *vomit*, the only proper food for ſuch vitiated ſtomachs."

The Antient Cathedral of Cornwall, Hiſtorically Surveyed. By John Whitaker, B. D. Rector of Ruan-lanyhorne, Cornwall. 2. Vols. 4to. Pp. 782. Stockdale. 1804.

AMONG the many excellencies which diſtinguiſh the writings of Mr. Whitaker, is the happy combination of individual intereſt with general truth and important inſtruction. He whoſe ſenſe of right and ſuſceptibility, of the appropriate impreſſions from beautiful and exalted objects, without deviating from facts, exhibited the lovely Mary, a charming, defenceleſs, forlorn woman, receiving every mortification from ſavages, and yet great, elevated, and engaging in all the viciſſitudes of her fortune; and exhibited a true caſe as ſtrongly as if it had been the fiction of Deſdemona and Belvidera, ſhewed his dramatic powers and hurried the reader into every view and ſentiment which he entertained himſelf. Here ſhone a man of genius, taſte, and feeling, a cavalier eagerly attentive to the dignities and diverſities of

of life. While he thus intereſted mankind in the fortunes of Mary, a charming and diſtreſſed woman of rank, he roſe to a different view of the ſubject, and traced rebellion and anarchy from the new levelling principles, which Calvin had diſſeminated on the Continent, and John Knox ſpread with ſuch deſtructive rapidity through Scotland, as to depoſe the ſovereign, and ſend her ultimately to what proved a ſcene of regicide.

From this view he riſes to a third, the abſurdity of all violent innovations, and draws a contraſt between moderate reformers and boundleſs revolutioniſts. Of the former caſt was Luther, who propoſed to correct abuſes without deſtroying eſſentials; of the latter Calvin, who propoſed to overturn hierarchy and monarchy, and to level all ranks and diſtinctions. In the former of the above mentioned qualities Mr. Whitaker muſt always delight; and in the latter muſt always inſtruct.

The ſubject of Mary commanded and excited an intereſt; but Mr. Whitaker from the ardour of his ſenſibility, and the vigour of his imagination can beſtow impreſſiveneſs on topics which in themſelves appear little ſuſceptible of intereſting exhibition. Our author is the uniform, able, and ardent ſupporter of the crown and mitre, as the beſt conſervators of beneficial polity and genuine religion. To monarchy and prelacy he never fails to aſcribe the transcendent ſuperiority of the Britiſh nation. There are and have been countries in which biſhops have, and have had more power than in England; but in no country have prelates and other clergymen ſuch an influence over all true votaries of Chriſtianity and the Church, as in our own country. Mr. Whitaker, deeply impreſſed with the momentous importance of kings and biſhops, is anxious to prove, hiſtorically, that their juriſdiction exiſted in certain parts of Britain at an earlier period than is embraced by authenticated records.

The purpoſe of this work is to ſhew, from a collation of paſſages and facts in authors preceeding the ninth or eighth centuries, that Cornwall was a biſhoprick and a monarchy. This is naturally, and neceſſarily, a ſubject which involves a great maſs of antiquarian conjecture; and of which the really hiſtorical materials being very ſcanty muſt be ſupplied by ingenuity and imagination. Of the Corniſh our author admits we knew very little until the tenth century, when, being conquered by Athelſtan, they became part of the kingdom of England.

Having brought them to this point, our author takes a retroſpective view of what the Corniſh may have been before; but his main object of enquiry is the ſituation of the Corniſh cathedral. It is difficult, and indeed almoſt impoſſible, to analyze antiquarian conjectures. We ſhall therefore exhibit rather than analyze, and preſent the moſt eſſential parts in the author's own words. He enquires where was the ſeat of the Corniſh biſhoprick, whether at St. German's or Bodmin. The following is the paſſage:

"The entire conqueſt of Cornwall being thus ſhewn to have been made by Athelſtan in 936; and Athelſtan being thus proved to have ſignalized the

the year of his conqueſt, by the wiſe meaſures which he took in that year for ſecuring them, by conciliating his newly-acquired ſubjects, with acts of pious liberality to their country, and with deeds of devout reverence to their ſaints; I go on to point out what was the ſeat of the Corniſh biſhoprick, St. German's or Bodmin, before or under this new ſupremacy of England. Groſs miſtakes have been made upon the ſubject, but I hope to rectify them. The ſtudy of antiquarian litertature is yet in its infancy only among us; and the manly deduction of inference from premiſes judiciouſly ſtated, has been little practiſed hitherto by our antiquaries."

"To St. German's, as Camden tells us, 'the biſhop's ſee was tranſlated,' from what place he does not expreſs, but certainly means from Bodmin, 'for greater ſafety in the time of the Daniſh wars;' though, in the very line preceeding, he acknowledges St. German's to be merely a village' at that period. Where then could poſſibly exiſt 'the greater ſafety' of the ſee? 'The buſhopes ſea', with more explicitneſs adds Norden, who wrote his work in 1584, 'was planted here (at St German's) in the Daniſh troubles, *browghte hyther from Bodman*;' or, as Norden writes ſtill more explicitly in another place, 'one Herſtane, about a° 906, was conſecrated buſhop' of Cornwal, 'whoſe ſee was at Bodmyn and called St. Petrocks whiche churche, with the cloyſter, was conſumed by the Danes, and *then* was the ſee *removed to St. German's*'. But Dr. Borlaſe ſubjoins to both, with an aſtoniſhing confuſion of ideas, what tells us nothing beſides the tranſlation of the ſee from Bodmin to St. German's. 'King Athelſtan,' he cries, 'is *ſaid* to have appointed one Conan biſhop here (A. D. 936). King Edred, brother to Athelſtan, who began his reign in 946, and died in 955 (Speed, Chron. p. 346), is alſo *ſaid* to have *ordained St. German's to be a biſhop's ſee*; but, as *all hiſtories agree*, that the biſhop of Cornwall *did not remove from Bodman* till the year 981, it is *very unlikely* that there ſhould be a biſhop *here* before that time, as biſhop Tanner rightly obſerves; neither does it ſeem *neceſſary* that there ſhould be two biſhops in ſo narrow a ſlip of land as Cornwall, and but one at Crediton for all Devon, a country of ſo much larger extent. The following particulars *may* ſerve in *ſome* meaſure to diſcover the truth. I find Edred a benefactor to the ſee of Bodman; for Henry III. confirmed to the monks there the manor of Newton, in the ſame manner as king Edred had granted it. *Very likely* this was given in order to augment the revenues of the biſhopric there; and, for the ſame reaſon, he *might* have appointed the the biſhop of Bodman to be biſhop of St. German's too. Again: Conan is ſaid to be the name of the firſt biſhop, placed *here* by king Athelſtan. I find alſo that Conan was *ſecond* biſhop in the ſee of *Bodman*, in the time of king Athelſtan; it is *poſſible* therefore that Athelſtan *might* annex *his new priory of St. German to the ſee of Bodman*, for the better maintenance of the epiſpopal dignity, and [might have] ordered alſo *that St. German's ſhould partake of the epiſcopal title*; by which diſpoſition I *imagine* that Conan, *at that time biſhop of Bodman*, became biſhop of *Bodman and St. German's too*;—and this *might* give occaſion to the miſtakes of St German's being one biſhopric, and Bodman another; but *theſe things I offer only as conjectures*.' I ſhall not ſtop to expoſe this maſs of conjectures, all pleading a falſe probability of reaſon againſt a poſitive aſſertion of hiſtory, all founded upon a falſe aſſumption, and all tending to a falſe concluſion. I ſhall only ſhew the reality, and leave theſe reveries to die away at its ſide.

"In the diviſion of the Weſt-Saxons biſhopric,' as Malmsbury informs us,

us, 'this is obſervable, that he who had his ſee at Wincheſter poſſeſſed two counties, Hampſhire and Surry; the other who had his ſee at Shireburn, poſſeſſed Wiltſhire, Dorſetſhire, Berkſhire, Somerſhire, Devonſhire, and *Cornwall*—On the death of Ethelward,' biſhop of Sherborn, 'the Weſt-Saxon epiſcopate ceaſed for ſeven years, under the compelling violence of hoſtility. But at laſt Pleymund, archbiſhop of Canterbury, 'and king Edward the ſon of Alfred, obliged by the threats and edicts of the Pope—, appointed five biſhops inſtead of two, Ethelm to the Church of Wells, Eduif to that of Crediton, Werſtern to that of Shireburn, *Athelſtan to that of Cornwall*, Fideſtan to that of Wincheſter. Ethelm therefore had Somerſetſhire, Edulf Devonſhire, *Athelſtan Cornwall.*' That Cornwall *then* formed, or was *then* to form biſhopric of *itſelf*, is evident from this appointment of Athelſtan to *it*, and of Edulf to *Devonſhire*. This was ſo early as 910, becauſe Fideſtan, we know, 'feng to diſcopdome on Winteceſtre,' or became biſhop of Wincheſter in that year. But it muſt have been a part of one, many centuries before. As the Britons, on the Roman dereliction of the iſland, naturally loſt the Roman diviſions of provinces, and relapſed again into their only diviſions by realms; ſo every realm becoming a biſhopric, Damnonium formed at once a kingdom and a prelacy. Thus does the epiſcopate of Damnonium mount up for its origin, even to the middle of the fifth century! This had its ſeat undoubtedly at Exeter, equally the capital of the realm and the metropolis of the biſhopric; continuing to have it as long as the kingdom of the Damnonii continued entire. But when Damnonium, *eaſt of the Exe*, was reduced by the Saxons, and Exeter itſelf was poſſeſſed only in part by the Corniſh, under the permiſſion too of the Engliſh; a new capital and a new metropolis muſt have been appointed, by the Damnonii *weſt of the Exe*. At what time this event happened, and Exeter loſt its civil with its ſpiritual ſupremacy over Cornwall, we may aſcertain by theſe ſucceſſive incidents of hiſtory.

Our author concludes that Leſcard was the ſeat of monarchy and St. German's of hierarchy. We do not find his arguments upon the ſubject altogether concluſive, but they are as probable as any that are likely to be adduced upon ſubjects of ſo very remote a diſtance from the light of true hiſtory. St. German's was the original See of Cornwall founded about the year 614, when Leſcard became the ſeat of Corniſh royalty; but both the biſhopric and kingdom were three centuries afterwards entirely annihilated and amalgamated with England. During this ſtate of Cornwall there exiſted ſeveral men of high rank under the names of Earls and Dukes, but the power of theſe nobles became ſo dangerous to the kings, that they uſed every means in their power to ſuppreſs the orders. Our author next proceeds to an account of the Corniſh monaſtery. In chapter ſecond ſection firſt, he ſums up the evidence on which he concludes that the original Cathedral of Cornwall was at St. German's, and then goes on to a very lively and picturesque deſcription of the Cathedral itſelf; both which paſſages we think worthy of quotation.—

"I have now ſhewn from the certain reports of hiſtory, that the original cathedral of Cornwall was at St. Germans. I therefore proceed to a new kind of teſtimony, in favour of the ſame point. The very church of

St.

St. German's concurs with all at this day; there we ſee the cathedral exiſting with all the ſignatures of a cathedral to the preſent moment; while the church of Bodmin exhibits no ſigns, and ſo preſerves no traditions of any epiſcopal pre-eminence that it ever enjoyed by itſelf or with another; the church of St. Germans preſents various relicts, and retains various traditions of that cathedral dignity which is long maintained without a partner, and even with a partner maintained in a high tone of ſuperiority over all the churches of Cornwall. The church of Bodmin indeed as I have previouſly noted, was rebuilt about 1125; and all traces of its epiſcopacy *may* have then periſhed with its epiſcopal church: but as this church became epiſcopal after it was built, and merely as a cathedral ſubſidiary to St. German's, it could never have had any *original* emblems of its epiſcopate, and moſt probably had never any *permanent* at all; if it had ever poſſeſſed ſuch, they would have been protected in the demolition, we may be ſure, with a ſolicitude ſimilar to what was ſhewn, concerning the chapel of St. Petrock: and the tradition, which has fled equally with the ſignatures themſelves, would then have been cheriſhed with peculiar livelineſs, by appealing continually to thoſe ſenſible vouchers for its veracity

"The church of St. German's conſiſts at preſent of a nave and two ailes, almoſt entirely built of a ſtone brought from a quarry about four miles off, that is called from its poſition Tarton Down. The nave is entered under a large portal from the weſt, flanked on the north and ſouth with a tower. Both theſe riſe ſquare about two thirds of their height, even to the entablature of each; both are aſſerted by tradition to have then formed an octangular turret for the remainder, and that on the north ſtill forms one THE SOUTHERN TOWER AND SOUTHERN AILE COMPOSED THE SMALL CATHEDRAL. Theſe are apparently one whole in themſelves. Cloſe to this tower on the ſouth, and with it forming the weſtern termination of that aile, is what was the primary portal of the cathedral; a ſmall porch of an oblong ſquare, with one door to the weſt, one to the ſouth, and a third on the eaſt into the Church; it was therefore the one only entrance into the church originally, but equally from the ſouth and weſt. The ground on both ſides has riſen ſo very high ſince the conſtruction of the church, that there is now a decent into it of one ſtep by the weſtern doorway, and of three by the ſouthern; though there ſtill remains, as there muſt always have been a decent of four from it into the church. This ſtrongly marks the antiquity of the building. The tower adjoining to the porch has a ſmall arch facing the aile, and had a large one looking north, but now cloſed up. The aile itſelf is only the breadth of this tower and that porch, about ſix-and-twenty feet only. So narrow was the cathedral of Cornwall! But the whole is apparently divided, as a complete church of itſelf, into two parts, the body and the chancil. The former runs on with the breadth above, about eight-and-forty feet; but then contracts into a breadth of twenty-two and a half only for a length of thirty-ſeven.

"At the upper end of this chancil, is what was apparently formed for and is popularly conſidered as THE BISHOP'S THRONE, being a rounded niche a foot deep in the very ſubſtance of the eaſtern wall, *evidently made with it*, and fixed in the middle between the two windows there. It is about ſix feet in height, with two and a half in breadth, having a ſtone ſeat at the bottom, and this raiſed ſix feet nine inches above the level of the floor. At the head of this niche is *within* are ſome ſmall *fillets* of ſtone; and a ſmall dove of ſtone, as an emblem of the Holy Ghoſt, in the centre. On each ſide

ſide of the niche *without* are the remains of a ſtaff carved on the wall carrying a croſs-piece on the top, and preſenting the appearance of a tall crutch; the true CROZIER of antiquity, as I ſhall hereafter ſhew. Directly over the niche is equally carved upon the wall, but remains more evident to the eye at preſent, a large and tall MITRE, ſurmounted by a croſs.

"Near this but in the *ſouthern* wall, is another niche, equally coæval with the wall itſelf, yet much lower in elevation, and very different in form: it is not rounded at the back and top, but flat behind and archlike above, having much ornamental carving on ſome ſmall pillars that are tied by a *faſcia* of ſtone into a neat kind of arch, or (to expreſs myſelf for once in language more technical in itſelf, but more obſcure to the generality) the arch, which appears to have been formerly ſcalloped, reſts on three cluſtered columns upon each ſide while the pediment over the arch, and the fineals of the buttreſſes at the ſides, are richly purfled, as beneath the arch is an ornament of quarterfoils: and this niche carries, equally with that, a ſtone ſeat at the bottom. This then I conſider, without any aid from tradition, and from the mere analogy of the whole, to be THE STALL OF THE CHAPLAIN; the only officer under the biſhop, then attending continually upon him, but acting equally as a chaplain and a chancellor to him. Thus the kings of Wales retained only one clergyman in the train of their court, as late as the tenth century; who was generally called the *offeiriad*, or the adminiſtrator of the Euchariſt; who was to bleſs the meat at meals, *chant the Lords Prayer*, and then ſit down at the table oppoſite to the maſter of the king's hounds. He ranked in dignity next to the very prefect of the palace; was always to be about the perſon of the king, as one of his inſeparable attendants; and with thoſe two officers immediately below him, the ſteward and the judge of the houſehold, was to keep up the dignity of the court in *determining ſuch cauſes as the king did not attend himſelf*. He was alſo to reſide in what was denominated the chaplain's houſe, together with his ſcholars, that were training up for orders under him; and for that reaſon aſſuredly was to preſent, juſt as our lord chancellor for a ſimilar reaſon, but under greater reſtrictions, preſents now to churches in the royal patronage. We find alſo our Saxon and Norman kings, attended each like the Britiſh with a ſingle chaplain only. Thus Ingulphus ſpeaks of '*the preſbyter* of the royal palace,' in the days of Edmund Ironſide; the Saxon Chronicle notices one Giffard in the reign of Henry I. as 'the king's hire-clerc,' or family-clergyman; and the ſame Chronicle again notices, in the reign of the Conqueror, ſeveral biſhops elect, as what the notice immediately preceding ſhews them to be *ſucceſſively* the king's chaplain's, or 'the king's clerks.' Juſt ſo we find Canute, when ſovereign of all England, repreſented by the ſame Chronicle, as giving a church of his own foundation to '*his own prieſt*, whoſe name was Stigand." But, to come cloſer to the point, we ſee as early as 710 'Acca, *Wilfrid's prieſt*,' conſecrated to the biſhopric that Wilfrid had held before; and in 685, upon John's reſignation of the biſhopric of York, 'Wilfrid *his prieſt*," conſecrated to it. So accurately is a ſingle ſeat formed, for the ſingle clergyman then attendant on the biſhop!"

Mr. Whitaker enters into an hiſtorical ſurvey of the cathedral; and from its internal ſtate, endeavours to confirm his favourite poſition of the ſupremacy of the St. German's cathedral, while Cornwall was independent. It would far exceed the boundaries of our Review,

to

to follow our author through every fact or conjecture, which he ſtates in ſupport of his favourite poſition. He enters into a diſſertation concerning the quantities of gold, which in the time of the Saxons were employed, either in enriching or decorating churches. He details the churches which received the greateſt amount of ſuch gifts and ornaments; and this part of his account, though ſomewhat a digreſſion from the cathedral of Cornwall, preſents an agreeable and able view of the ſtate of religious edifices thoughout England before the Norman conqueſt. The Corniſh cathedral was upon the Saxon model, as our author illuſtrates, by detailing the architecture of that building, and of the Saxon places of worſhip. The portal, however, is not Saxon; but an addition made to St. German's Church by the Normans. Mr. Whitaker enquires whether ſpires were brought from the Eaſt, according to the opinion of many from the cruſades; but our author contends there exiſted ſpires in Normandy before the cruſades commenced. He mentions ſeveral objections that have been made to the St. German's cathedral; and endeavours to prove that they are more imaginary than real. Our author in chapter third, proceeds to the religious edifices that were framed after the Norman conqueſt; and contains a great deal of architectural antiquity, that will be very pleaſant to readers who reliſh ſuch reſearches. Mr. Whitaker from our churches very naturally proceeds to our bells. Theſe inſtruments had been much uſed among the Saxons, who exerciſed upon them no ſmall portion of muſical ſkill and dexterity. The impreſſion made upon the Normans by thoſe performances is very ably exhibited, and annexed to the account mention is made of the chief bells in England. The following are the author's words.

"The Normans of England heard the harmony of our bell-towers; were delighted with its ſoothing, mellow, melancholy tones, and ſo continued it to the preſent times. Of this we have a remarkable evidence, *at the very moment.* 'He cauſed two *great* bells to be made,' ſays Ingulphus, a *Norman* prior of Croyland, *juſt after* the conqueſt, concerning a *Saxon* prior, about *a century before,* 'which he named Bartholomew and Betteline, and two *middle* bells, which he called Turketyl and Tatwin; and two *leſſer* bells, which he entitled Pega and Bega: but lord Turketyl, the abbot, had previouſly cauſed one *very great* bell to be made, Guthlac by name; which being now united with the bells aforeſaid,' as this Norman exclaims, with the ſoul of a Saxon transfuſed into him, ALL FORMED A WONDERFUL PEAL OF HARMONY, nor was there THEN ſuch A SET OF TUNEABLE BELLS IN ALL ENGLAND.' And ſo thoroughly was the love of bell-harmony diffuſed through the whole kingdom, that John Major, the Scotch hiſtorian of the *ſixteenth* century, deſcribes it in terms ſeemingly raiſed beyond the truth by his aſtoniſhment at it. In St. Edmundſbury, he cries, 'is reported to be the greateſt bell of all England;' though, 'in England is a vaſt number of bells of the fineſt tone, becauſe England abounds with the materials for bells; and, as they are reported to *excel all mankind in muſic,*' a compliment to our national genius, very amazing in itſelf, and peculiarly amazing for the time; yet previouſly founded by our author, not on mere report, but upon *his own opinion*; 'ſo likewiſe do they excel in *the*

ſoft

ſoft and ingenious modulation of their bells. Not a village of forty houſes you ſee, *without five bells of the ſweeteſt tones*; and in every manſion-houſe of any ſize, you will always hear *the moſt agreeable chimes playing every third hour.* While I was ſtudying at Cambridge, upon the great feſtivals *I ſpent very many nights without ſleep*, liſtening *to the melody of the bells.* The univerſity ſtands upon a river, and the ſound is the ſweeter from the undulation of the water. There are no bells in England thought ſuperior to thoſe of Oſeney abbey, near Oxford. 'When they want to form a fine tone, with the common materials they mix *a quantity of ſilver.* The Walloons and the Flanderkins are ſaid to obſerve the ſame rule as the Engliſh, in their ſweet-toned bells.' This accout of our own fondneſs and that of our fathers, for

So muſical a diſcord, ſuch ſweet thunder,

as are produced by the fine tones of our church-bells, is truly ſtriking to *my* mind, yet little known to the public at large. This fondneſs now appears to have commenced before the conqueſt, to have gone on uninterrupted by it, and at laſt to have repleniſhed almoſt all our church-towers from the cathedral and the conventual down to the parochial, with peals of bells.

"But let me add to this account of our bells in general, by noting the ſize of ſome of them in particular. At Weſtminſter abbey, ſays an author of the *fourteenth* century, 'are two bells, which *over all the bells in the world* obtain the precedence in wonderful *ſize* and ſound.' Yet we know much more diſtinctly from a writer of the *twelfth*, that at the cathedral of Canterbury the prior, Conrad, fixed in the clock-houſe five *exceedingly great bells*; of which one required *eight* men, two others *ten* each, the fourth *eleven*, and the fifth even *twenty-four*, to ring them. We thus ſeem to mount the *climax* of ſize in bells, and to ſtand at the very ſummit of it. Yet we do not, as we can mount ſtill higher. A ſucceeding prior, in the very ſame century, ſet up a bell in the clock-houſe, which demanded no leſs than *two-and-thirty* men to ring it. In what exact degree of compariſon to this ſtands that great bell at St. Paul's, which announces the death of the biſhop or of any of the royal family; or that ſtill greater, I believe, which by the hundred and one ſtrokes of its clapper proclaims to the colleges at Oxford the hour of ſhutting the gates in the evening; I leave others to determine. Certainly all of a ſpecified ſize above continue riſing in a cale of grandeur till they have riſen very high; and the laſt, I believe, ſtands at a height of magnificence, ſuperior to either that at St. Paul's, or to this which has the repute of being the largeſt in England at preſent, the celebrated *Tom* of Oxford, traditionally known to be a derivative from the adjoining abbey of Oſeney, and therefore uniting once with others there, to form the peal ſo highly commended by Major above."

Returning to his text our author proceeds with his ſurvey of the Cathedral. He now inſtitutes an enquiry concerning the hiſtorical origin of the croſier and mitre. When the croſier was adopted he confeſſes himſelf uninformed. Of the origin of the mitre he preſents the following very ingenious account.

"Yet ſtill a queſtion recurs to the inquiſitive mind, when and from whence this peculiar kind of crown was ſelected, as an ornament to the heads of biſhops. This queſtion I wiſh to anſwer ſatisfactorily, becauſe Montfaucon has erred egregiouſly concerning it, and his authority is likely

to

to carry a ſiniſter influence upon my readers. 'The epiſcopal mitre,' he avers, '*ſix or ſeven centuries ago* was only *a bonnet or cap with a sharp point*,' and not "the mitre of theſe later ages.' This averment, however, is very falſe. In contradiction to it, I need only appeal to the mitre on the walls of our own church. That refutes the aſſertion directly. That cannot be later than the throne, over which it is carved; and neither of them can be later than the epiſcopal dignity, once attached to the church: that therefore cannot be less than 'ſix or ſeven centuries' old; as I ſhall hereafter ſhew the dignity to have been taken away, more than *ſeven* centuries ago. But we can happily mount to a much earlier period, and Montfaucon himſelf ſhall aid us in our aſcent.

Gemmeus iſte tibi miles et hoſtis erit.

"We come now," ſays this very extenſively learned writer, 'to the moſt curious and ſingular repreſentation of the Syrian goddess,' Cybele; this is the inſcription, *Mater Deor. Mater Syriæ.* The figure is very extraordinary and remarkable in all its parts. She is in a ſitting poſture, and hath upon her head AN EPISCOPAL MITRE, adorned on the lower part with towers and pinnacles—. The goddess wears a ſort of ſurplice, *exactly like the surplice of a priest or bishop*; and upon the ſurplice a tunic, which falls down to the legs; and over all *an episcopal cope*, with the twelve ſigns of the zodiac wrought on the borders.—This figure, *if it be indeed antique*, repreſents Nature—. *What gives us room to suspect is*, that we find this figure *only* in ſome drawings of Pirro Ligorio, an ancient Neapolitan painter,' who lived about two centuries ago; and who ſays '*he copied it from an antique* of Virginio Urſini, count of Anguillara. This is that Pirro Ligorio, whom that ſkilful antiquary Raphael Febretti frequently blames, in his book of Trajan's pillar, but chiefly in his large collection of inſcriptions.—But *what increases our suspicion the more* is, we *observe nothing of this kind* in the *habits* of *Cybele*, or any other deity. Nevertheleſs, Bellori, a very ſkilful antiquary, hath publiſhed it, and without intimating any manner of doubt concerning the truth of this monument.' Bellori, in my opinion, ſhewed the judiciouſneſs of his mind by this manner of acting. The monument is aſſuredly genuine. Singularity can never prove ſpuriouſneſs: if it ſhould, there could not poſſibly exiſt in the world ſuch a monument as an *unique*. Nor can any cenſure from Fabretti upon Ligorio ſuffice to make us diſbelieve the latter, when he ſays that 'he copied it from an antique;' and eſpecially when he adds, that this very antique was in the poſſeſſion 'of Virginio Urſini, count of Anguillara.' Even Montfaucon himſelf, however modeſt, however timid, who therefore pronounces the monument 'very doubtful' at the head of his chapter; yet comes at the cloſe, we ſee, to reſt upon the opinion of Bellori, to praiſe Bellori's ſkill in ſuch monuments, and to refer without reprehenſion to Bellori, for his publication of it without one expreſſion of doubt. The grand reaſons in Montfaucon's mind for doubting at all, were his full conviction, that the mitre of a biſhop only a few centuries ago was different from this, a conviction which I have ſhewn to be all erroneous; and a perſuaſion equally full, which I can equally prove to be erroneous, that we obſerve 'nothing of this kind,' no *mitre* particularly, 'in the habits of Cybele.' The very *appellation of mitre* is derived from the language, as the very *use* of a *mitre* is found in the practice, of the prieſts or prieſteſſes of Cybele.

"She and they were all Phrygian together, and wore what they called the

mitre

mitra in Phrygian, as the appropriate, exclusive symbol of all; the mitre being originally a bonnet for females in Phrygia, *therefore* worn by herself, and *so* worn by her feminine priests after her. This appears from some lines in Virgil, which Montfaucon has astonishingly overlooked. There the rough African, Iarbas, thus sneers at Æneas and his Trojans as Phrygians, as the votaries and priests of the Phrygian Cybele:

> Et nunc ille Paris, cum *semiviro* comitatu,
> *Mæoniâ* mentum *mitrâ*, crinemque madentum,
> Submexus.

So expressly is the *mitre* denominated the *Mæonian*, as the instituted ensign of *Cybele*, the daughter of Mæon! So plainly did the enunch priests of Cybele in the days of Virgil at least, and for such a time before as could authorize even a poet to place the fact cotemporary with the Trojan war, move in their ministries to their goddess; with mitres placed upon their heads, but tied under their chins, exactly like the mitres of our bishops! Virgil has even applied the sarcasm a second time, and made Turnus like Iarbas to insult over the Trojans in a strain of allusion to the Pnrygian priests of Cybele:

> Vobis *picta croco* et *fulgenti murice* vestis;
> Desidiæ cordi; *juvat indulgere choreis*,
> Et *tunicæ manicas* et habent redimicula MITRÆ:
> O verè Phrygiæ, neque enim Phryges, ite per alta
> *Dindyma*, ubi assuetis *biforem dat tibia cantum*;
> *Tympana*, vox, luxusque vocat *Berecynthia matris*
> *Idææ*.

The Trojans thus appear a second time insulted as Phrygians, as therefore the worshippers of the Phrygian goddess, as consequently having priests emasculated, effeminate, clad in tunics half purple, half saffron in colour, with long sleeves to them, crowned with MITRES that had long strings, and dancing on the mountains of Phrygia, Dindymus, Berecynthus, or Ida, to the united sounds of their own voices, of their double flutes, and of their drums."

He attempts to prove that the Saxon bishops had a throne as well as a mitre. Some of the latter sections of the first volume are taken up in giving an account of Germanus, who in the fifth century, appears to have come from the continent into Britain, to convert the people to Christianity. At this period our author diverges into an account of the heresies that were then prevalent; mentions the names, and tells anecdotes of various bishops. Chapter iv. section 7. is devoted to an account of the extinction of Druidism in Cornwall, and section 8. which closes Vol. I. details various customs that still remain, having their origin in druidical superstition.

Volume II. commences with an account of various holy men, who from different quarters came to instruct the Cornish in religion; and those who are fond of legendary tales about saints, and nuns, and friars, will be much gratified by this part of the narrative. There appears to be an accurate list of the various Cornish saints with their respective habitations and sphere of influence. Germanus was the complete subverter of Druidism, and to him our author appears to impute the

introduction of genuine Chriſtianity into that diſtrict. In honour of him was the place at which the cathedral was built called St. German's. Our author ſpeaks very highly of a king of Cornwall who flouriſhed in the fourth century; embraced the Chriſtian religion under the adopted appellation of Solomon; "revered (ſays our author) in Cornwall, revered in Wales, and worthy of all reverence throughout the Chriſtian world." Mr. Whitaker attacks Dr. Borlaſe's legend concerning the calendar of Cornwall, and proves that that writer has greatly exaggerated the number of ſaints. Having ſaid a few words more of Corniſh churches and religion, our author proceeds to an account of diſtinguiſhed ſpiritual edifices throughout the kingdom, ſuch as Verulam. He now commences a diſſertation upon church architecture in general, which laſts through the third ſection of the fifth chapter. The firſt ſection of the the ſixth ſeems to have for its object the coincidence of the Erſe, Welſh, Iriſh, and Corniſh languages as all dialects of the Celtic. On this ſubject the author's fertile genius throws as much novelty as can be beſtowed on a topic which has of late been ſo often diſcuſſed. The ſecond ſection of chapter VI. reverting to the cathedral, and mentioning one of the towers, confutes an account delivered by Mr. Bentham; and deduces bells and bell towers from the Roman conqueſts. The hiſtorical ſurvey goes on accompanied by ſome account of Corniſh prelates, who flouriſhed during the independence of that diſtrict. The prelacy of Cornwall was very well endowed, nevertheleſs the biſhops complained that the revenues were ſcanty. Mr. Whitaker proceeds to a deſcription of various other churches and chapels, with anecdotes of different biſhops, and other clergymen. It would be unneceſſary for us to detail thoſe buildings, which would be anticipating the pleaſure that the reader muſt, if a man of taſte and piety, derive from very glowing deſcriptions of objects which are ſo very conducive to devotion. In the courſe of the work our author lays before his readers a very accurate account of the internal œconomy of a priory; which, as he juſtly obſerves, few Proteſtants at preſent make a ſubject of ſtudy, however curious and amuſing.

Having to his own ſatisfaction eſtabliſhed his grand poſition, that Cornwall enjoyed monarchy and hierarchy before it was conquered by the Saxons; and that St. German's was the ſeat of the Corniſh biſhop, he concludes in the following words,

"In this manner was a prelacy and a royalty eſtabliſhed formerly among the Corniſh; Cornwall being modelled at once into a kingdom and a biſhopric. In this manner too, was the metropolis of the latter ſettled at St. German's, and the capital of the former fixed at Leſkard. Both went on in the ſame courſe of continuance, till the power of the Saxons, like an Alpine ſnowball, growing with its own progreſs, and ſwelling from its own accumulations, came ruſhing upon them both with an overwhelming ſweep of violence. Then the ſecular monarchy was buried for ever, but the eccleſiaſtical ſtill reared its head above the waſte. The Corniſh epiſcopate remained, under the ſway of the Saxons; and even received a magnificent

magnificent addition to its cathedral, from the Chriſtianity imbibed by the Saxons on their ſettlement among Chriſtians. Nor did the Normans come to St. German's, with the Saxon heatheniſm renewed upon theſe ſeeming Saxons of Denmark. They came with the Chriſtianity of the Saxons, communicated equally to the Normans by the Chriſtians of France; and with the architecture of France, improved by its nearer neighbourhood to Italy. They came to lend more elegance and more grandeur to the Britiſh, to the Saxon church of the Corniſh ſee. Even when this ſee migrated to Exeter, it merely reverted back to its original abode; and the current, after many wanderings to the right or left, only rejoined the ocean from which it had ſprung before.

"In tracing this current, I have been enabled to lay before my reader many a fine object upon the banks, important in itſelf and in its conſequences, important to Cornwall in particular, important to the iſland in general. I have diſplayed that period of the Corniſh hiſtory, in the full light of hiſtorical radiance; which has hitherto been buried in the clouds and miſts of ignorance, yet concerns the very ſaints, male or female, that almoſt every pariſh acknowledges in its name, that almoſt every town honours in its wake, and that form a neceſſary link in the chain of Corniſh hiſtory. But I have not confined myſelf, like a limitary intelligencer, to this peculiar orb. I have ranged over the iſland, held up the origin of Gothic and of modern architecture within it, the origin of cheſs, the origin of free-maſons, the origin of armorial bearings; pointed out the period at which all the grander parts of our large churches, the chancel, the nave, or the aile, the bell-tower, the lantern, the ſpire, or the chapel, were added to them, or at which thoſe peculiar decorations of our cathedrals, the mitre, the croſier, or the throne, appeared within them; and exhibiting ſeveral churches in Britain, as built by the very Romans themſelves, yet exiſtent ſtill in part or in whole among us. I have ſhewn the abbey-church of St. Alban's, in direct contradiction to *its own* hiſtorian, to be one of the number. In doing all this, I flatter myſelf I have been uſefully employed, have added ſomething to the ſtock of antiquarian knowledge, have enlarged ſomewhat the bounds of hiſtorical certainty, and have broke open ſome new fountains of intelligence, hiſtorical or antiquarian, for the benefit of the public."

Moſt readers we think will agree with us in opinion that the queſtion here canvaſſed is not of the higheſt intereſt. Nevertheleſs, the genius of the author beſtows a luſtre upon the topic which he treats; and makes what is naturally waſte and dreary, pleaſant and engaging. We did not think it poſſible that on an apparently dry ſubject of antiquarian reſearch, there could be introduced ſuch amuſement and entertainment. We give high credit to the powerful genius of Mr. Whitaker, which can produce ſuch an effect with ſo very unpromiſing materials. It is almoſt needleſs to remark, in mentioning a production of ſuch an author, that he embraces and creates opportunities of doing juſtice to our church and king; and the conſtitution as connected with them. Would all clergymen were like Mr. Whitaker; then we ſhould have no methodiſts, independents, or other diſturbers of the public peace, at leaſt in our pulpits.

Caſſas's *Travels in Iſtria and Dalmatia.*

(Continued from p. 404.)

AFTER purſuing his inveſtigations for ſome time in the valley and burgh of Sloſella, the moſt barren, and diſagreeable ſpot in this region, our author embarked at Sebenico, to proceed to Spalatro; and in his way through the channel, he made a variety of remarks on the different iſlets, which were formerly inhabited by the Romans. An inſcription found in the 16th century in one of theſe iſlands, called Zlarin, excited a long controverſy amongſt the learned men of that period. It conſiſted of an epitaph on a queen named Panſania, who is no where mentioned in hiſtory, and the literati reſorting to conjecture, concluded, that it related to a queen, who had been made priſoner by the Romans, and baniſhed to that iſle, after having appeared in the triumphant proceſſion of a Conſul. Our traveller ſtarts ſome objections to the opinion of theſe gentlemen, by ſuppoſing that they may have been deceived by ſpurious copies of the inſcription; or might have read ſome other name for Panſania, as the letters ſculptured anterior to the reign of Auguſtus were in general badly formed; hence he infers, that they might have read Panſania inſtead of Pauſaniæ, which would have ſhewn the inſcription to relate to the victories of Pauſanias; while the title of queen, ſaid to be found in this inſcription, might have related to Juno, to whom the ancients gave it as an honorary term. Theſe ſuppoſitions, although they do not in our opinion refute the concluſions of the learned men already mentioned, nevertheleſs place the talents of our author in a very favourable view, by ſhewing, that he did not travel merely as an artiſt to make drawings of ſuch ruins as lay before him, but that his taſte for inveſtigation, and his knowledge of ancient hiſtory, often cauſed him to offer with modeſt deference a new hypotheſis on many points, which are ſtill involved in obſcurity.

Speaking of the abundance of Roman antiquities in the iſle of Zuri, our author makes the following remarks, in which, from a proper, though by no means immoderate attachment to antiquarian knowledge, we cordially join him.

"It is to be hoped, that the century which has lately commenced, will be diſtinguiſhed by this kind of ſtudy and reſearch; that their promoters will repreſs the prejudices of ignorance and avarice, which cauſe the oppoſition on the part of the different hordes, to the making of excavations, the importance of which is well underſtood; and that, finally, this ſcience, which may be conſidered as hitherto only ſuperficially known, in conſequence of the oppoſition and indifference of governments, and the ridicule of intereſted individuals, will ceaſe to be conjectural. This hope is founded upon the direction, which the events at the cloſe of the eighteenth century have given to mankind, relative to glory and the arts. Every age thinks itſelf called upon to adopt, and be proud of, the reigning taſte; but taſte is only a relative term:—it is a ſentimental impreſſion, received from the ſurrounding objects

objects: and when it is refined, it does not prove that men are more learned, but that they are better."

Our traveller, after leaving the iſle of Zuri on his right, proceeded in a direction to the eaſtward, with a view of examining the conſiderable canal of Braza, on which the town of Spalatro is ſituated. In his courſe thither, he paſſed between San Marco and Pianco, two ſmall iſlets, left to the ſouth the iſle of Zivana, and doubled the weſtern extremity of Trau, having the iſle of Solta in a ſouth eaſterly direction. Among other obſervations made by M. Caſſas on the iſle of Trau, he ſtates, that according to ſome ancient authors, particularly Ptolemy and Strabo, the ſeparation was formed by Nature, an opinion, which is, however, oppoſed by Spon, who argues, on the authority of a learned man, a native of that country, named John Lucius, that the canal is a work of art. Of this Lucius we learn, that he was born at Trau, and had acquired his education at Rome; and that ſo great and diſtinguiſhed were his talents, that he not only enjoyed the univerſal eſteem of all the literati in Italy in the ſeventeenth century; but that he alſo, at the inſtigation of the celebrated Ugheli, undertook to write the hiſtory of his country under the title of "*Dalmatia illuſtrata, ſeu Commentaria Rerum Dalmatiæ et Croatiæ*;" this work made its appearance in the year 1666, and has ſince that time been reprinted at Vienna in the year 1758, forming a part of the "*Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum.*"

As Spon has ſo accurately reported the inſcriptions diſcovered at Trau and Bua, we ſhall not repeat the remarks of M. Caſſas on the ſame ſubject. Our claſſical readers will recollect, that this iſland, under the empire, bore the name of Boas, and was rendered important by the exile of a number of perſons, celebrated for their theological contentions; but when we conſider the admirable climate of this place, we can hardly think that their exile was a puniſhment: for, according to M. Caſſas, it is ſo highly favoured by Nature, as to produce the fruits of Europe and Aſia, as well as to admit of the naturalization of the palm-tree of Africa. It alſo affords abundance of the fineſt Aſphaltes, which is ſaid to have been employed by the Egyptians for embalming their kings. The iſle of Trau is equally rich in ſoil, and agreeable in climate, ſo that both ſituations would form a perfect paradiſe were it not for the deſtructive plague of inſects.

"The temperature and ſhort duration of winter, which is in general very mild, and in all the low parts of this country is ſcarcely felt for two months in the year, preſerves them from death, though their delicacy would prove their deſtruction, if they were ſubjected for two or three days even to a ſlight froſt. All the grain is generally infeſted by a deſtructive worm, which is here called *Magnacoz*. Theſe little inſects blaſt the hopes of the moſt abundant harveſts; and perhaps the impoſſibility of oppoſing their ravages is partly the cauſe that the induſtrious agriculturiſt prefers the culture of the vine and olive to that of wheat, which would ſucceed ſo well on account of the general fertility of the ſoil. But the exiſtence of man being here attacked, by the deſtruction of the articles neceſſary for his ſupport, is

only an inferior misfortune: his very life is every inſtant in danger, from the aſſaults of two ſpecies of venomous tarantula. Theſe inſects are known in the Illyrian dialect by the generic name of *Pauk*, which is applied to all ſpecies of ſpiders; but one of them is the real tarantula, ſo well known, and juſtly dreaded, in Calabria. The other is the Corſican Tarantula, known in that iſland under the name of *Malmignata*; and which differs from the firſt by having ſhorter legs: but they have both the common property with thoſe of Naples, of being hairy and ſpeckled; while, if any variety be perceptible, it is only in the colours. Theſe odious inſects, whoſe very appearance is diſguſting, do not poſſeſs the timidity of other kinds, who flee from the ſight and approach of man; but they are at once miſchievous, impudent, and ferocious. They bite, not for the purpoſe of defending themſelves, or of procuring food, but from an evident wiſh to do injury; and it is only by continual vigilance, that thoſe whoſe labours keep them in the fields the whole of the ſummer, can ſecure themſelves from their attacks; while their precautions are often unavailing. What they are particularly obliged to avoid, is ſleeping in the open air, either in meadows, at the foot of trees, or on the ſtacks of grain which are got in.

"Fortunately, theſe inſects ſeldom penetrate into the houſes; ſo that the fields are the theatre of their animoſity. Their bite produces here the ſame effect as in Calabria and Corſica; and their poiſon is commmunicated to the blood with dreadful rapidity. The moſt effectual remedy is to cut off immediately the piece of fleſh which has received the impreſſion of their teeth, or to cauterize the wound with burning charcoal, or a hot iron: the leaſt delay often proves fatal; a heavineſs is then ſpeedily felt over the whole frame; the circulation is checked; the blood coagulates; drowſineſs ſucceeds, and is attended with convulſions and delirium, which terminate in death. A violent agitation is the only means of preſerving the patient from the deſtruction which threatens him; and it is the acknowledged neceſſity of this agitation which has given riſe to the opinion, that the venom of the tarantula is to be expelled by muſic. It is however certain, that in the county of Trau they do not have recourſe to muſic, but exerciſe the patient violently, and for a long time, in a kind of ſwing:---this produces abundant tranſpiration, and ſometimes nauſea, which ſaves the perſon's life, by diminiſhing the maſs of venom abſorbed, and reſtoring the blood to its proper circulation. But although life is thus preſerved, it is, unfortunately, but very ſeldom that the fibres of the brain are unaffected; ſo that the patient often loſes his ſenſes."

Our traveller purſued his courſe in ſafety to the bay of Spalatro, the impreſſive appearance from which he deſcribes in the following terms:

"At the entrance of the bay you diſcover Spalatro, and nothing is more intereſting than this perſpective. The firſt range of buildings which ſtrikes the eye, are the high and long walls which inclose the Lazaretto; at one end they reach to the great mole which encircles the port; and at the other they join the fortifications of the town, and ſeem, of themſelves, an immenſe and formidable rampart, with which an attempt had been made to cover this part of Spalatro. In front, and on the edge of the quay, which extends along the port, incloſed between the great and ſmall mole, there appears, with ſuch majeſty as is undeſcribable, the auguſt remains of the long and ſtupendous colonnade which decorated the maritime façade of the palace

palace of Diocletian: it immediately gives an idea of this Coloſſus of architecture, particularly to thoſe who know that this colonnade occupies only one of the narrow faces of the parallellogram which formed the palace. Beyond this colonnade you perceive, with ſome difficulty, the roofs of the modern buildings, conſtructed within the walls of the palace; but the eye is delighted to behold, riſing from the midſt of this prodigious maſs of ruins, a ſquare tower, five ſtories high, and decorated with different orders of architecture. It is that of the Cathedral, or Duomo, which is likewiſe incloſed within the walls of this palace; while at one of the angles of theſe mural ſtructures, riſe the thick ſides of another gloomy and embattled tower, the gothic aſpect of which excites a melancholy recollection of thoſe barbarous Vandals who effaced as it were from the earth the ſovereign people of the world, as well as of thoſe great monarchs, the Cæſars, who, even in the midſt of diſgrace, were able to lay the foundation of monuments which empires could ſcarcely raiſe in the midſt of their ſplendour. To the left, the town is more expoſed, and ſinks beneath the view, while the appearance of the modeſt roofs of the ſimple citizens tends to conſole the mind for the melancholy impreſſion it has received from viewing the ruins of the imperial palace, the lazaretto and the feudal towers, thoſe mute evidences of the moſt fatal plagues of mankind, peſtilence, war, and pride! But while through the trees with which the ramparts are ſhaded, you diſtinguiſh the walls which form the defence of Spalatro, and the two extremities of which terminate on the ſhore, the view which clears this warlike cincture extends agreeably acroſs the irregularly united houſes, which compoſe on one ſide the ſuburbs of Lucio, and on the other of Borgo-Grande. It is there, that in the trees which crown them, in the chearful opulence of the orchards, and in the verdure of the gardens, we are charmed on beholding the beauty of Nature in a picture from which, in all ages, the arts appear to have been inclined to baniſh it, though in vain. Here Nature is ſtill great, even by the ſide of all in which man has endeavoured to appear greater. What, in ſhort, are the gigantic ruins of Spalatro, when compared to the Mount of Marigliana, the feet of which ſeem to repel the waves of the bay, while its ſummit defies the tempeſt? What is Spalatro itſelf at the baſe of this enormous mountain, on whoſe top the defiance and fury of man have built the bulwarks of war, and depoſited the apparatus of battle! How does that pyramid appear which was erected by the art of man at a prodigious expence to decorate the temple of the gods, when it is ſeen from the prodigious range of ſteep rocks, of mountains heaped upon mountains, which bound the horizon, and form the frame-work of that incommenſurate coliſæum, in the centre of which Spalatro, notwithſtanding its magnificence, may be ſaid to diſappear. Hence, on entering the bay, the high mountain of Marigliano, or Margliano, on one ſide, on the other the promontory and its eſcarpement; farther on, the rock which ſupports the fort of la Grippe; in the valley, Spalatro, its lazaretto, ruins, and ſteeples; at the horizon a chain of the mountains of Morlachia:---ſuch are the maſſes which at once ſtrike the eye, and remind the obſerver of the periſhable ſtate of his power, the indefatigable deſtruction of time, and the boldneſs of ſavage Nature."

From the liberal uſe which the author makes of the epithet Nature, and a knowledge in what ſenſe that term was uſed by the philoſophiſts and atheiſts of the revolution, an inference might be

drawn diſadvantageous to his religious character. Such an inference would, however, be precipitate and partial; for we no where obſerve, notwithſtanding the devotion of M. Caſſas to Pagan hiſtory, that he treats the Chriſtian religion with indifference.

The Catholic religion, we learn, was eſtabliſhed at Spalatro in the ſixth century, and received archiepiſcopal honours, the archbiſhop of which took the title of "Primate of Dalmatia and Croatia." It was not till the twelfth century, that Spalatro fell under the dominion of Venice.

We think the detailed account of the palace of Diocletian, with which our author has furniſhed us, is more complete, and intelligible, than any we have hitherto peruſed of that celebrated remnant of antiquity,; and it will be intereſting to the antiquarian to compare his account with that given by Spon, who travelled about the year 1670, in order to aſcertain the decay which it has undergone ſince that period. For in ſome ſubſequent paſſages of M. Caſſas, we are aſſured that ſeveral places, which in the time of Spon contained ruins of a conſiderable extent, are now nothing but barren plains of ſand, in which not a veſtige is to be found, except by excavation.

The following is the account given by M. Caſſas of the magnificent palace of Diocletian, conſidering it in the ſtate it muſt have been, when inhabited by that monarch.

"We have already obſerved that its figure was a parallelogram; it was 630 feet long, by 510 in width. Its principal façade is ſuppoſed to be that which looked towards the ſea. It was this which was decorated by the ſuperb colonnade that ſtill remains almoſt entire, and which conſiſted of fifty columns: at preſent only forty-two are ſtanding. This colonnade formed a gallery twenty-five feet in width: while its length occupied the whole of the façade: and in the interior of this gallery were the apartments excluſively inhabited by the Emperor. The entrance to this amazing palace was, and ſtill is, by three principal gates: The firſt is at the north front, and is called *Porta Aurea*, or the Golden Gate; the two others are at the eaſt and weſt façades; their particular denomination, if they had any, has not been tranſmitted to poſterity. Each of theſe gates had two octagonal towers, whoſe height did not exceed that of the edifice in general. There was alſo a ſquare tower at each angle of the palace. Each of theſe towers was eighteen feet higher than the walls. Two of them contained four ſtories, while the others had only three; this difference aroſe from the elevation of the façade with the colonnade being ſeventy-four feet; while the three other fronts were only fifty-five; ſo that the two towers that correſponded with the two ends of the colonnade, were of neceſſity carried higher than thoſe which were built at the oppoſite angles; laſtly, in the interval between the octagonal towers of the gates and the towers of the angles, there was an additional ſquare tower, but the height of which did not exceed that of the wall:---the total number of theſe various towers was ſixteen, becauſe the façade of the colonnade had no others than thoſe which correſponded with its two extremities.

A large portico was erected on the inſide, along the wall of the north, eaſt, and weſt façade; and was only interrupted by the maſſy ſides of the three gates, on the reverſe of which were the ſtairs which communicated with the upper apartments. On entering by the Golden Gate, there appeared

peared in front a large street, formed by a vast portico, and which extended as far as the peristyle of what was properly called the Palace, or the part which was inhabited by Diocletian. This street was intersected at a right-angle, and nearly in the centre of the whole edifice, by another street of equal width, and likewise decorated with a portico, which extended from the eastern to the western gate. Hence on entering, for example, at the Golden Gate, you had on the right and left two large ranges of building, equal in proportion, but not so in point of interior arrangement: they were surrounded at two of their faces by the portico lately mentioned; while the two other faces, which looked towards the external walls of the edifice, were separated by large courts, which were formed between these buildings and the general portico. Of these two buildings, that on the right was appropriated to the women, while that on the left was occupied by the principal officers in the service of the Emperor.

"After passing these buildings and quitting the transverse street, you found yourself in a superb colonnade, which was terminated by the steps and façade of the peristyle. Between the columns there appeared on one side the Temple of Esculapius, and on the other the Temple of Jupiter:---as both of these are still entire, we shall speak of them hereafter. To enter the grand building, or the part of the palace inhabited by Diocletian, you ascended the peristyle just mentioned, by a flight of steps: the front of this peristyle was supported by four columns; and it led to a magnificent circular vestibule, admirably proportioned, which derived the light from its cupola: it was decorated with four niches, which contained statues. In front of the door, leading to this vestibule, was that through which you arrived at the principal hall of the palace. This apartment was ninety-five feet long, by seventy-five wide; to the right and left six columns, of a prodigious elevation, supported the vault or cieling of this hall, leaving on each side, between them and the wall, a kind of side-way, or walk, not quite so long as the hall; and at the end of which were two flights of spiral stairs, which led to the subterraneous parts, and the back-door of the palace, which opened on the sea-shore. This grand hall had a large and majestic door, by which you entered the great gallery already mentioned: the hall was denominated *Atrium*.

"All the palaces of the Romans contained halls of this kind, and which bore a similar name. Writers differ in opinion as to the nature of those apartments; but they all agree, that the *Atrium* was situated at the entrance of the palaces and great houses.---Some, however, think that it was a kind of court which preceded the vestibule, while others consider it as the vestibule itself; and lastly, several assert it to be the hall which succeeded the vestibule, as for example: Martial, when speaking of the *Atrium* of the celebrated palace of Nero, seems to indicate, that it was placed in the same situation, as we have described that to be in the palace of Diocletian. 'It was in the Atrium,' says he, 'that you saw the colossus of Nero, and the machines which belonged to the theatre, *Pegmata*.' He denominates it *Atria regis*, while Suetonius seems to cast some obscurity on this definition, by calling *Vestibulum*, what Martial denominates *Atrium*. It cannot, however, be doubted, that they both mean the same place, since Suetonius says, '*Vestibulum ejus fuit in quo colossus*,' &c.

"It is nevertheless certain, that the *Atrium* differed from the courts, inasmuch as it was covered in, and was situated at the entrance of the mansions. When the virtues were, however, honoured in the Republic, the

mothers

mothers of a family, the Roman ladies, frequently paſſed their time in this hall, where they employed themſelves amidſt their numerous domeſtics, and attended at once to their children and their houſhold affairs. During winter the *Atrium* was heated by chafing diſhes, and fires placed in tripods. In proceſs of time, and when luxury had made that alarming progreſs which led Rome to ſlavery and deſtruction, the *Atrium* was abandoned to the vaſſals, and they attended in it to receive the orders of their maſters. It was here that the crowd of clients, who ſerved in the ſtreets as a retinue to the conſuls, ſenators, magiſtrates, and tribunes, aſſembled to await their egreſs. The emperors came into the *Atrium* to give audience to the ambaſſadors of foreign kings and princes; and the haughty patricians decorated it with the images of their anceſtors; the generals, with the trophies of their victories; and the pro-conſuls, with the ſpoils of provinces, and the fruit of their rapine. In general the cielings were hung with purple, and the columns which ſuſtained it, were of porphyr, granite, or other marble ſtill more valuable. In ſhort, the pomp or the ſimplicity of the *Atrium* was a ſure token of the vices or the virtues of the maſter of the palace, and on entering this part of the building, one might preconceive a tolerably juſt idea of his pride, his ſimplicity, or his avarice. We may judge, for example, by the gigantic proportion of that of the palace we are deſcribing, of the means which Diocletian took to preſerve the remembrance of the coloſſal power he had enjoyed, as well as of the invincible propenſity which accompanied him throughout his life for grand and majeſtic monuments, the laſt remains of which now form at Spalatro the ſubject of wonder and admiration.

"The two parts of the palace which were on the right and left of the *Atrium*, were exactly ſimilar in their diſtribution; and from this circumſtance it may be ſuppoſed that the emperor occupied each diviſion alternately, perhaps according to ſome etiquette founded upon the change of ſeaſons; from ſome prejudice which prevailed in thoſe diſtant ages; or from a religious practice relative to the worſhip of the gods, with the ceremonies of which we are unacquainted. This laſt motive may reaſonably be imagined, ſince one of the diviſions contained the temple of Eſculapius, and the other the temple of Jupiter, while the interior apartments led through each other immediately to thoſe temples. May it not be aſſerted, as a reaſon for this extraordinary reſemblance in the arrangement of the two parts, that Diocletian might have preſumed, that Maximian Hercules his colleague in the empire, and whoſe abdication, which was ſolicited by Galerius, was of the ſame date as his own, might come to viſit him in his retreat; that he might be anxious to give him the ſame accommodation in his palace as he enjoyed himſelf, without the moſt minute difference; or that his intention might be that there ſhould always prevail between them in their private life that amicable equality which was never altered by the diviſion of the ſovereign power?

It will, however, be ſufficient to give a deſcription of one of theſe two parts, ſince the other was exactly ſimilar in form, the only difference being in the names given to the apartments, which doubtleſsly correſponded to the uſes to which they were devoted. It would appear from the diſtribution of this palace, that the architects of the early ages did not attach the ſame merit as we do to thoſe majeſtic communications between the large diviſions of an edifice, and which at the preſent day we diſtinguiſh by the French appellation of *enfilades*. It is, however, certain, that if the entrance

were

were by means of handſome lateral doors, from the halls on each ſide, the magnificence of the view would be increaſed: on the contrary, in order to arrive at thoſe halls or chambers, they paſſed from the *Atrium* into two very narrow corridors, which were beſides ſo aukwardly placed, that, of the three doors in which they terminated, and which opened into three magnificent halls, whether to the right or to the left of the *Atrium*, two of the doors were ſituated in the angles of theſe halls.

"Of the two parts of the edifice, which on each ſide of the *Atrium* were parallel to the great gallery, the firſt was appropriated to concerts and theatrical repreſentations, and the ſecond to certain regular feſtivals: they were eighty-five feet long by fifty-eight wide, and their cielings were ſupported by eighteen columns. The diſtance between theſe columns and the walls was ten feet in every part, ſo that there was a ſufficient ſpace for walking round the hall, or for placing rows of ſeats for the accommodation of the ſpectators, while the middle remained entirely free for the amuſements. That which was deſtined for the feſtivals was not, however, the only one appropriated to that purpoſe: in one half of the two firſt-mentioned halls there were alſo two other ſmaller ones, though theſe were of a very conſiderable ſize, and ſerved only for repaſts. They were diſtinguiſhed by the epithets Corinthian and Cizician, and they derived theſe names from their decorations or from the nature of the feſtivities which took place within them. But even theſe were not ſufficient, for there were on the ſides of the latter two other tetraſtyle halls, which were likewiſe appropriated to feaſting; and as they were neareſt to the two temples, they doubtleſs ſerved for the repaſts which followed the ſacrifices.

"Beyond the halls or chambers juſt mentioned, were the hot-baths. They were large and commodious, and the deſcent to them was by ſteps conſtructed at the four angles. Three chambers were attached to theſe baths. The firſt was the *Apodyterion*, the uſe of which, as well as its name, was derived from the Greeks: it was either the place where the hot water was prepared, or that uſed for wreſtling or gymnaſtic exerciſes. The Romans frequently called it by the generic name *Apodyterium*, but ſometimes *Spoliarium*, *Tepidarium*, *Ærium*, &c. Theſe names, however had other acceptations, or exceptions Hence, for example, when they gave the name of *Tepidarium* to the *Apodyterium*, it was like taking a part for the whole; for *Tepidarium* ſignified the warm quality of the bath, or generally a warm bath: *Spoliarium* was likewiſe the generic name for all places in which the Romans undreſſed themſelves for any purpoſe whatever. Thus for example, if *Spoliarium* was applicable to the baths, the ſame name was given to the place in which the Gladiators undreſſed themſelves to fight, to that in which the citizens were ſtripped who had been killed by accident, at a diſtance from their houſes, as well as to the ſpot on which an unfortunate perſon had been robbed or murdered by banditti.

"But with reſpect to the *Apodyterium*, in its firſt-mentioned acceptation, we muſt obſerve, by the way, that the fineſt *Apodyterium* known in ancient times, was erected by order of Diocletian. It belonged to the thermal baths which were conſtructed by his directions at Rome, and which ſtill bear his name. It was an immenſe ſaloon of an oblong form, with eight ſides or faces, each of which were of themſelves ſemicircular; the arches which bound the roof of this ſaloon, were of a prodigious height, and the walls were covered with the fineſt marble, and the moſt elegant ornaments.

"But this was a public edifice, and the *Apodyterion* of Spalatro, which

was

was intended only for the uſe of the emperor and his houſhold, had not, nor did it require, any of the magnificence given to that of Rome. It was only a ſimple chamber, by the ſide of which was the *Sphæriſterium* or place of exerciſe; in which, according to Pliny, was played the game of tennis or fives. It is not a ſubject of ſurprize, that this hall was contiguous to the baths, becauſe it is well known that the Romans moſtly amuſed themſelves with active exerciſes before bathing. Theſe baths were only uſed at the cloſe of day; and for this reaſon, alſo, they were accompanied by the different chambers devoted to evening-repaſts. Theſe meals, after the manners of the Republic had become corrupted, were nothing elſe than the orgies of debauchery, for they were not what the Romans called the ſupper. Their ſupper was commonly taken at the ninth hour of their day, which correſponds with our three o'clock in the afternoon; while their dinner took place at the fifth hour, that is at eleven o'clock in the forenoon. This dinner was, however, properly ſpeaking, nothing more than a light breakfaſt, and of ſuch little conſequence, that it was conſidered as a breach o politeneſs to invite their friends to partake of it.

"Inſtead of imagining as we do, that the bath immediately after a meal is dangerous to health, the Romans ran thither as ſoon as they quitted table, but particularly after they had abandoned themſelves to intemperance; and for this cuſtom they have been reproached by Juvenal. Hence, if it were with them, a means of promoting digeſtion, it is not aſtoniſhing that the neceſſity of the evening's repaſt was the reſult of the bath; and we will add to the diſgrace of that enlightened people, that it was natural, when the paſſions had been excited by the indiſcriminate mixture of the ſexes, ſo long tolerated in the public baths, that theſe nocturnal repaſts ſhould in a little time have degenerated into the revelries of voluptuouſneſs, though they were at firſt reſorted to as a meaſure of neceſſity. The emperors Adrian, Marcus Aurelius, and Alexander Severus, wiſhed the two ſexes to have their baths apart, but the prevalence of licentiouſneſs conſtantly induced the people to evade their decrees; and theſe diſgraceful proceedings were not entirely aboliſhed till after Conſtantine; and even then, perhaps, to give place to a corruption of another kind, and to ſatisfy the jealous, though not leſs libidinous paſſions of a few innovators.

"In the upper ſtory of the warm baths at the palace of Spalatro, and in the contiguous chambers, there were two other kinds, namely, the cold and the vapour baths. The latter tended to promote perſpiration, and on quitting them, the bathers entered a room which was always kept of an equal and moderate temperature, in order to prepare the body to paſs without danger into the external air. On this floor alſo, was the chamber in which the emperor repoſed. It was formed of three ſemi-circular parts, in one of which was his bed, and the entrance to which, was through a portico, conſiſting of two columns and three arcades; theſe were cloſed by curtains of purple, and ſeparated the chamber from the gallery in which the ſoldiers attended, who were appointed to guard his perſon.

"Such was the magnificent palace of Spalatro, of which we have attempted to give an idea, though without being able to avoid the obſcurity inſeparable from this kind of deſcription."

It muſt not, however, be ſuppoſed that this deſcription is in any great degree applicable to the preſent ſtate of thoſe vaſt ruins, for moſt of the interior buildings of the palace are deſtroyed. The portion that remains,

remains, is nevertheleſs ſufficient to prove the exiſtence of the whole, in the full extent and magnificence deſcribed by our traveller. We learn from him, that on entering at the golden gate, the face of the different ſplendid ſtructures with which it was graced in ancient times on the right, and amongſt the reſt the ſpot containing the *Gynæcéum* or apartment allotted to the women, is now completely altered by a crowd of habitations built in a modern ſtyle. On turning to the left, where the grand officers of the houſehold reſided, one can at preſent only diſtinguiſh the walls, forming the ſupport for modern dwellings. All that is left of the ancient ſtructure, is, the veſtibule of the palace, the colonade leading to it, and the temple of Jupiter; the remaining buildings are in a ruinous ſtate; and thoſe immenſe halls which formerly exiſted, are now occupied by houſes, ſtreets, and ſquares. A veſtige, however, is left in a remote corner, pointing out the ſpot where the apartments were, which belonged to the baths. With reſpect to the magnificent temple of Eſculapius, we learn that it is ſtill in exiſtence, but have to regret that the avenue leading to it is crowded with inns, ſhops, and magazines. In its preſent ſtate, it diſplays merely a ſhell of that ancient ſplendour, which called forth even the admiration and reſpect of barbariſm and ignorance itſelf, having ſuſtained no other injury but what the corroding tooth of time has produced on it. Of the towers, only thoſe remain which are ſituated on the angles; but all the reſt are completely demoliſhed, as well as thoſe which belonged to the three gates. The havock here, may probably have been in ſome meaſure occaſioned in conſequence of the wars, for it ſeems that there are evident proofs of the inhabitants having on various occaſions employed the external walls of the palace as a means of defence. The tops of theſe walls have alſo undergone a complete metamorphoſis, being now in many parts embattled, with loop-holes over the ancient arched windows. Numbers of theſe windows, we find, are blocked up, an alteration which moſt probably originated from motives of precaution. On the whole we muſt obſerve, that the preſent ruinous ſtate of this venerable pile undoubtedly bears ſtronger marks of a rude and violent hand, than of a gradual decay.

M. Caſſas after many ſcientific reſearches at Spalatro, proceeded to Salona, ſo celebrated in antiquity for its excellent trout, and great population. It is remarkable that this maritime town when viſited by Spon in the year 1672, contained ſeveral ſtupendous ruins of temples, and an amphitheatre; but M. Caſſas could with difficulty aſcertain the ſpot on which this building was ſituated; from which he conſiders it evident that the encroachment of the ſoil ſince the time of Spon muſt have increaſed with ten times greater rapidity than in fourteen preceding centuries! The cauſe of this rapid increaſe is well worthy of the inveſtigation of natural philoſophers.

In July our traveller returned to Trieſte, and on his way to Vienna, viſited the caſtle of Luegg, whence he hired guides to conduct him

him to the wonderful falls of the Ruecca, of which he gives the following account:

"This river runs between rocks of a conſiderable height, whoſe ruggedneſs is inſurmountable, even by the moſt adventurous herdſman: above theſe rocks appear the antique and diſmantled towers of the old caſtle of Novoſcoglio, exhibiting the veſtiges of ſavage feudality, in the boſom of more ſavage nature. Not far from this ſpot, is the village of San-Canciano, or Saint-Koſian, which is likewiſe ſituated on the ſummit of the rocks. At the foot of this village, the Reucca affords to thoſe who take delight in the phenomena of nature, a ſpectacle the like of which is ſeldom to be found in the world:—in this part the fiſſure in the rocks is ſo vertical, that they appear to have been cut by the hand of man, and this ſteepneſs is every where alike, however various may be the lines which they follow in their ſuperpoſition; but what adds ſtill more to their ſingularity, is their ſummits, which are cut with a ſort of ſymmetry, and appear like ſo many ſquare towers, that command and ſeem to defend thoſe gigantic walls; or they might rather be taken for battlements. At the baſe, that is to ſay, in the almoſt unfathomable abyſs formed by theſe natural ramparts, the Ruecca winds and runs with a ſort of majeſtic ſlowneſs, ſeeming to diſdain the oppoſition of the blocks with which its bed is every where interſperſed, till it ſuddenly arrives at an immenſe cavity, the frightful and ſombre periſtyle of a ſubterraneous gallery, of which the terrified imagination can neither gueſs nor meaſure the depth. In fact this gulph may be deſcribed as an enormous and inconceivable precipice, in which the waters of the Ruecca fall with a tremendous noiſe, and are loſt from the obſervance of man; but whither they go, to what depth they fall, or how long they have diſappeared in this receptacle, he has never been able to aſcertain, during thouſands of generations, and many ages will doubtleſs yet paſs away before this myſtery will be diſcovered. No one can conceive the dreadful and inceſſant roaring of the waves, in the deep cavities of this impenetrable abyſs, nor the terror which ſeizes on the ſpectator, at his firſt view of the gulph. It is here, by his unexpected humiliation, that man is compelled to acknowledge the limited extent of his mind; and though every where elſe he may be proud to think and act like a God, he here, perhaps for the firſt time, perceives his information to be only that of a ſubordinate creature. But this is not all, for the traveller, if he proceed no farther, will have but an incomplete idea of the ſingular deſtiny of the Ruecca; he muſt, if poſſible, paſs this mountain, or rather this gigantic wall, the fractured ſides of which abſorb the river. The other ſide affords a ſpectacle not leſs extraordinary, and perhaps ſtill more wild; the ſame ruggedneſs and nudity in the rocks, but more diſorder and confuſion: the maſſes, which are equally vertical here, obſtruct, interſect, and paſs each other in various directions, while the ſummits frequently come in contact, and at other times appear at a conſiderable diſtance from each other; in ſhort, the whole preſents the moſt ſhapeleſs and terrific chaos. It is in the midſt of theſe numerous blocks, that the Ruecca, after meandering through the bowels of the mountain, iſſues violently from a deep and narrow fiſſure, and diſgorges itſelf into a large baſon, 600 feet below the level of San-Canciano, which is ſo ſhaded by the elevation of the rocks, that it is conſtantly inacceſſible to the rays of the ſun. It is even pretended, that all attempts to aſcertain its depth by ſounding have proved ineffectual. In fact, this may be conſidered

dered as the tomb of a river, higly remarkable for its adventures: the threads of water which trickle from the overflowing of the baſon, after having run for ſome time acroſs the rocks that lie diſperſed below this kind of crater, diminiſh till they at length become imperceptible, and thus the Ruecca diſappears for ever."

At this ſpot the object of M. Caſſas's journey was at an end, and he returned to Rome.

We cannot cloſe our account of the production before us without re-regretting the want of a general patronage in this country for works of art amongſt perſons of rank and fortune, a want which will probably prevent ſuch books as the original before us from being naturalized, with all its beautiful accompaniments, a folio volume of engravings. With reſpect to the tranſlation, (in the volume of Contemporary Voyages and Travels) it doubtleſs poſſeſſes every advantage which the general reader can deſire; but we do not think it judicious to conſult the taſte of mere readers for amuſement, at the expence of thoſe who collect books for the advantage of ſtudy and reference. We are led to theſe remarks from obſerving the omiſſion of a great part of the hiſtorical introduction given with the original of Caſſas, though the particulars of the manners and cuſtoms of the people are judiciouſly abſtracted from it. But any abridgment of ſuch works militates againſt their general intereſt and utility; while an edition of voyages and travels like the one under our review, conducted, as it evidently is, by men of abiliſty, might be made eminently intereſting and uſeful. The ample quotations which we have given from the tranſlation of Caſſas, will not merely ſhew that the editor underſtands French, but that he muſt be a perſon of ſcientific attainments. The tranſlation alſo poſſeſſes a rare advantage:—it is perfectly free from Galliciſms.

An Hiſtorical Memoir of the Political Life of John Milton. By Charles Edward Mortimer, Eſq. 1 vol. 4to. Pp. 82. 7s. Vernor and Hood. 1805.

THE object of this literary trifle, (for notwithſtanding its pompous appearance in quarto, with all the embelliſhments of fine printing, paper, and engraving, we can call it nothing more) we ſhould be at ſome loſs to diſcover, were it not for a brief introduction, in which the author ſtates, that he is actuated by the laudable ambition of familiariſing the name of Milton *as a patriot*; and he adds,

"That he who refuſes the meed of gratitude to the patriots of the ſeventeenth century, deſerves not the enjoyment of thoſe bleſſings *which await* him in the nineteenth. Such man *in the preſent glorious ſtruggle for exiſtence*, will arm himſelf from fear rather than virtue; he is one who will enjoy, but will never preſerve a conſtitution; and were it not for the juſt indignation ſuch conduct would excite, he would idly repoſe himſelf upon his

his couch, and behold the empire torn from its baſis, and its admirable conſtitution crumble to ruins, without an effort or a ſigh."

This, which to us appears philoſophiſtical rant, may ſound very pretty in ſome ears, but we regard it with the eye of ſuſpicion. What are theſe mighty bleſſings *in embryo* with which we are to be ſurrounded, and what does this author mean by the preſent *glorious ſtruggle for exiſtence?* At the time this book was publiſhed (apparently the beginning of the preſent year), ſome leading rancorous and malevolent whigs were indeed making a precious ſtruggle, ſo far to ſhackle the liberty of the preſs, as to render nugatory all that Milton or any other writer had done, to preſerve its exiſtence ſecure from arbitrary power. We are ſo dull as to know of no other *glorious ſtruggle* which bears any analogy to that of the democratical madmen of the ſeventeenth century, or of the end of the eighteenth, than that which ſucceeded in deſtroying the character of an old, faithful, and independant veteran, whoſe whole life had been devoted to the public ſervice, and who to the preſent moment ſeems to be purſued with a degree of inveterate rancour, worthy of the ſatellites of Roberſpierre. We confeſs that we watch with ſome anxiety the progreſs of this *glorious ſtruggle*, the effects of which have already been felt in no ordinary degree, by all who are capable of affixing a juſt value on the privilege of independent writing, and oppoſing it to Palace-yard harangues, and revolutionary cant about public delinquency, privileged robbery, and ſimilar contemptible declamation, for which the Britiſh populace not many years ſince, would have dragged the declaimers to a horſe-pond. As to the preſervation of our Conſtitution, we can aſſure Mr. Mortimer that its ſecurity reſts in very able hands; that however often a few factious demagogues may attempt to chip from it fragments, and circumſcribe its vaſt extent, they will ultimately fail in their ſchemes, and that inſtead of ſeeing it torn from its baſis, every *true* patriot will ruſh forward and protect the venerable pile, with an ardour that will involve in laſting ſhame and infamy thoſe political ſycophants who would glory, under the maſk of reform, in reducing it to ruins.

"If any one continues the author, is capable of diſcovering one ſentiment, in the following memoir, that indicates a mind not thoroughly Britiſh, I would thank him for his ſagacity; but ſuch, I expect will not be found. To be born an Engliſhman, as an illuſtrious perſonage ſaid upon an illuſtrious occaſion, is the conſtant boaſt of my heart: to be a good ſubject will, I hope, always be the continual aim of my ambition."

We do not mean to diſpute that the author, who is evidently a young man, has not a Britiſh mind; but young minds are apt to be miſled, and to miſtake party malice for political integrity. The wretched people who dragged the royal family of France to the ſcaffold, being worked upon by thoſe deſpots who had influence over them, declared that to wade up to the knees in blood for the good of their country, was the deareſt wiſh of their heart, and many of them, doubtleſs, boaſted of being born Frenchmen! As to the memoir,

is nothing but a brief account of Milton's political career, which might be found at leaſt as ſatisfactorily given in any other life of that celebrated character. Some ſcraps of poetry are interſperſed, as are ſeveral quotations from Milton's political works, and the whole may be conſidered as an unequivocal eulogium upon that writer, abounding with very unjuſtifiable cenſure upon thoſe by whom his writings were conteſted. Thus Biſhop Hall is ſtigmatized as a ſcurrilous and ignominious writer, and ſome jargon is introduced about "the corrupt ſtate of the exiſting clergy," "the intolerance of the Biſhops," in the time of Charles I. &c.;—and he adds, that Milton was induced to forſake "the pleaſant paths of poeſy," in order to ſmother the forms of ſuperſtition, to free the enſlaved opinions of the multitude, to blunt the fetters of prejudice, &c. He then obſerves, that Milton's "Areopagitica," or a ſpeech upon the Liberty of the Preſs, dedicated to both Houſes of Parliament, was the moſt valuable legacy the country ever received from his hands, and here we have no heſitation to agree with him, and we ſincerely wiſh that the ſpirit of the writer were transfuſed into ſome upright politician of the preſent day.

"A little time previous to this period, (the publication of the Areopagitica) the parliament had iſſued an order, 'That no book, pamphlet, or paper ſhould be printed, unleſs the ſame was firſt approved and licenced by ſuch, or at leaſt one of ſuch as ſhould thereto be appointed.' To counteract, or rather to endeavour to get this edict repealed, was worthy the talents of Milton, and he thenceforth dictated a ſpeech to the parliament. 'We ſhould be wary,' ſays he, with ſingular energy, 'what perſecution we raiſe againſt the living labours of public men; how we ſpill that ſeaſoned life of man preſerved and ſtored up in books; ſince we ſee a kind of homicide may be committed, ſometimes a martyrdom, and if it extend to the whole impreſſion, a kind of maſſacre, whereof the execution ends not in the ſlaying of an elemental life, but ſtrikes at that etherial, and firſt eſſence, the breath of reaſon itſelf; and ſlays an immortality rather than a life.'—Having thus expreſſed his idea of the importance of his ſubject, he proceeds to give a chronological hiſtory of the Imprimatur, after drawing inſtances from the Athenians of their non-prohibition of any books, but thoſe which tended to blaſphemy, atheiſm, and libels. This is followed by numerous authorities tending to prove its inconvenience to individuals, and its fatal conſequences to literature; 'for,' ſays he, 'if it is true that a wiſe man, like a good refiner, can gather gold out of the droſſieſt volume, and that a fool will be a fool with the beſt of books, there is no reaſon, that we ſhould deprive a wiſe man of any advantage to his wiſdom, while we ſeek to reſtrain from a fool, that which being reſtrained will be no hindrance to his folly."

It is known that Milton in his travels had an interview with the famous Galileo, then a priſoner to the inquiſition. His ſentence, which will probably be new to many of our readers, is given in a note, and is as follows:

"Whereas you, Galileo, ſon of the late Vincent Galileo, being ſeventy

years of age, had a charge brought againſt you in the year 1615, in this holy office, that you held as true, an erroneous opinion held by many, viz. that the ſun is in the centre of the univerſal and immoveable, and that the earth moves even with a diurnal motion, &c. &c.

" This holy tribunal, deſiring to provide againſt the inconvenience and miſchiefs which have iſſued hence, and have increaſed to the danger of our holy faith, agreeably to the mandate of Lord N—— and the very eminent doctors, cardinals of this ſupreme and univerſal inquiſition, two opinions reſpecting the immoveability of the ſun, and the motion of the earth, were adopted and pronounced as under.

" That the ſun is in the centre of the world, and immoveable in reſpect of local motion, is an abſurd propoſition, falſe in philoſophy, and favourably heretical, ſeeing it is expreſsly contrary to Holy Scripture.

" That the earth is not in the centre of the world, nor immoveable, is falſe in philoſophy, and conſidered theologically, is at leaſt an error in faith, &c. &c. &c.

" But that your grievous and pernicious error and tranſgreſſion may not remain altogether unpuniſhed, and that you may hereafter be more cautious, ſerving as an example to others, that they may abſtain from the like offence, we decree, that the book of the Dialogue be prohibited by public edict, and we condemn yourſelf to the priſon of this office for a time to be limited to our diſcretion, and we enjoin, under the title of ſalutary penance, that, during three years to come, you recite, one a week, the ſeven penitentiary pſalms, &c. &c.

It was probably with reference to this ridiculous ſentence of the Jeſuits, that Milton alludes in Paradiſe Loſt, b. iii. l. 694.

The ſecond part of this book attempts to prove, on the authority of Milton, that the Eikon Baſiliké (or as the author pleaſes to call it, Baſilik*on*) was not the production of Charles I.

" The Eikon Baſilike, under the ſanction of being written by the king, was uſhered into the world at a time when the fury of the people begun to cool. The effect was naturally to be dreaded: it had the ſame tendency as the will of Cæſar, and paſſed through fifty editions in the courſe of one year, at home and abroad. The kingdom, by the publication of the Eikon, had, in ſome meaſure forgotten *the crimes and the follies* of the deceaſed king, and were raiſed to compaſſion for his misfortunes, by the reading what was conſidered as his dying apology. The confeſſion of ſome errors, and the vindication of others, had wrought *a temporary belief* in the goodneſs of his intentions, and there were not wanting many, even of the popular party, who begun to conſider him rather as an ill adviſed and unfortunate monarch, than as a prince acting up to the hereditary opinions of his family.

" To counteract theſe impreſſions, Milton was employed by the government to write ſomething by way of reply; in conſequence of which he publiſhed his Iconoclaſtes, or the Image Breaker. The candour with which he begins this celebrated anſwer, and the ſolemnity of the period, have been frequent ſubjects of applauſe."

Very likely, but it is juſt that kind of affected candour, which under the maſk of ſympathy, exhibits the exultation of the writer over

over fallen greatneſs, and is equally diſcreditable to his talents and his heart. We deſpiſe that ſycophancy, which pretends that the public conduct only of a great man ſhould be attacked, and at the ſame time employs every artifice of language, to bring his private reputation into contempt.

Some trite remarks on Milton's Iconoclaſtes, and an unqualified encomium on his anſwers to Salmaſius's Defenſio Regia pro Carolo primo, form the whole of this ſingular volume. Salmaſius is repreſented as cloſing his learned exiſtence abaſhed, torn, and ſmarting with wounds. In ſhort, the venerable Peter du Moulin, and every other writer who oppoſed the republican virulence of Milton, are ſtigmatized as vulgar, abuſive, and contemptible ſcribblers: and on the other hand, Milton is extolled for aiming at the deſtruction of tithes, which in the opinion of our *enlightened* author "have to this day, more impeded the true intereſts of religion than any other meaſure ever adopted!"—The efforts which Milton made to overturn the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment, or as our author chooſes to ſay, to *ſupercede* it in an *equitable* manner are pretty generally underſtood. The equity he alludes to, we conceive to be on a par with that liberal ſyſtem of the Catholics, ſo admirably defined by the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury, in his ſpeech on the 13th inſt. direct *equality* for the preſent, and unqualified *ſuperiority* in future!

The obſervation in page 81 of this publication, that the reaſon of Milton for refuſing an appointment under government, was his "determination to live and die an honeſt man," ſeems to be brought in for no other purpoſe than to elicit the contemptible inference, that none but bad men would accept any civil employment, by which they could promote the advantage of their country. In ſhort we can diſcover no definite object in this book.—That it can do no harm is ſelf-evident.

"One knows not where to have it,
'Tis neither fiſh nor fleſh."

An Addreſs to Lord Teignmouth, Preſident of the Britiſh and Foreign Bible Society, occaſioned by his Addreſs to the Clergy of the Church of England. By a Country Clergyman. 8vo. Pp. 36. Rivingtons. 1805.

A Letter to a Country Clergyman, occaſioned by his Addreſs to Lord Teignmouth, Preſident of the Britiſh and Foreign Bible Society. By a Sub-urban Clergyman, 8vo. Pp. 61. 1s. 6d. 1805.

THIS new Society was eſtabliſhed under the auſpices of Mr. Granville Sharp, a gentleman well known in the learned world, a Diſſenter, we believe, and moreover diſtinguiſhed for his marked oppoſition to, and abuſe of, the Slave Trade. The Addreſs to the Clergy, adverted to in the title pages of the Tracts before us, is pre-

fixed to a plan of the Society, with a list of the Subscribers, which was circulated pretty widely, and was sent, among others, to the writer of this Article, who is not ashamed to confess that, in perusing it, he felt considerable surprize, and experienced many of those sensations which it appears to have produced on the mind of the *Country Clergyman*.—But it may, perhaps, be satisfactory to our readers, to suffer Lord Teignmouth to speak for himself, before we offer the few sentiments and comments which have suggested themselves to us on the subject.

SIR,

"The Society which now takes the liberty to address you, founds its claim to your notice, upon the nature of its object:" (which is) "To promote the circulation of the Scriptures at home and abroad; an object in which every one, who professes the religion of Christ, must feel a deep interest.

"The *liberal basis* of its establishment, also, which unites to a degree perhaps unexampled, the zeal and exertions of Christians, of the several denominations, to which the constitution of this happy country affords equal protection, will doubtless give additional force to the claims arising from the simplicity, purity, and importance of its design.

"It cannot be doubted, that in every part of the United Kingdom, there are many, who are actuated with the true spirit of Christian benevolence, and who only want proper opportunities of manifesting it.—The British and Foreign Bible Society now presents such an opportunity to them, and solicits your assistance in making it known, as well as your influence and co-operation in promoting the object of its association.

"The Society is fully sensible of the happy results to be expected from the combined exertions of the Christian community, and is required by a sense of duty to call them forth in the advancement of a work, which it can with confidence recommend to the blessing of God, and the support of every good man."

This Address is signed *Teignmouth*, President; and dated September 1804.

In every plan, institution, or measure, there are two points for consideration: The *object* proposed to be accomplished, and the *means* by which it is to be accomplished. Now that the circulation of the Scriptures is an *object* eminently laudable is a fact that can be disputed only by those who deny that they are the works of Inspiration, or that they contain the word of God; or who disbelieve the doctrine which they promulgate. But that *every means* for the accomplishment of such an object are justifiable, the most furious zealot, we suspect, will scarcely venture to maintain. The *means*, therefore, become a fair object of discussion; about which men, actuated by motives equally pure, may conscientiously, and with propriety, differ, as in any other point which calls for the exercise of opinion and of judgment. To us, we acknowledge, the association of men of different religious persuasions, for the attainment of an object, which might as well, if not better, be attained by the separate exertions of each description, appears

appears liable to many ſerious and weighty objections.—It would be foreign from our purpoſe to preſs all thoſe objections upon our readers, indeed, any adequate diſcuſſion of them would occupy a much greater portion of our Review, than we can poſſibly allot to ſuch a ſubject. One objection, however, which ſtrikes us moſt forcibly, we ſhall merely ſuggeſt for the conſideration of others: If the heads of our Church, and its members, publicly aſſociate and act with Diſſenters and Sectariſts of every denomination, on a ſubject of religion, will not numbers of their weaker and more ignorant followers be naturally led to view ſuch Sectariſts with a more favourable eye, to lend to their tenets a more favourable ear, and, by degrees, to conſider it as a matter of indifference whether they frequent *their* conventicles and meeting-houſes, or *their own* pariſh churches!—Unleſs our experience and knowledge of the human mind be woefully defective, or moſt ſtrangely miſlead us, this will be one of the natural conſequences of ſuch an aſſociation, and, if ſo, it is truly a ſufficient reaſon for diſſolving it; provided the ſame object can be attained by different means. Moſt certainly the ſame object *can* be attained by other means; for every member of the Church of England may become a member of *The Society for promoting Chriſtian Knowledge*, and have the ſame opportunity as this new Society affords, for circulating the Scriptures at a very eaſy price. Indeed, if the Prelates and other reſpectable perſonages whoſe names appear in the liſt before us, and who are already members of the Society for promoting Chriſtian Knowledge, were to add to their preſent ſubſcriptions in *that* Society, what they contribute to this new Society, they would, we are perſuaded, acquire much greater means for extending the circulation of the Scriptures, and in a much better, becauſe wholly unobjectionable, manner. The Sectariſts, with whom they are now aſſociated, might be left to purſue their object in their own way, either by aſſociating as at preſent, or by joining ſome other Societies of the ſame perſuaſion with themſelves.

After this brief, and very partial, ſtatement of our own notions on the ſubject, we ſhall proceed to the conſideration of the pamphlets themſelves.—The *Country Clergyman*, begins by reminding Lord Teignmouth, that he muſt not take it for granted, that, becauſe a Society profeſſes to have only one object, and that of a laudable nature, it may not have others, and of a very different deſcription, in view; and he adduces, in proof of this poſition, the example of various political Sectaries, whoſe profeſſions were particular, but whoſe views were treaſonable. He then expreſſes his aſtoniſhment, after profeſſing his reſpect for the nobleman whom he addreſſes, that his Lordſhip ſhould recommend ſuch an Inſtitution to a Clergyman of the Church of England.

"In this liſt, I muſt acknowledge, I ſee many reſpectable names, with which I ſhould be happy to place mine. But I likewiſe ſee a very large proportion of others, with which, as an honeſt man, I can have nothing to do; I ſee many names of perſons, whoſe objects and purſuits have been diametrically the oppoſite of mine: what I build, they pull down: what I

teach they mock, and endeavour to render ineffectual. The ſacred cauſe, which as a Clergyman of the Church of England, I have ſworn to ſerve and ſupport, (and which, with the beſt talents I have, I will ſupport, as long as I have my life,) they hold up to ſcorn and abuſe with hard names and jeers. They vilify my character, as a ſervant of the Moſt Higheſt, and ſet me forth to the world, as a diſhoneſt man. Now, were I, my Lord, allured by your Lordſhip's invitation, and tempted by the ſound of what you call the "liberal baſis of your eſtabliſhment;" (the ſenſe of which I have not yet apprehended:) ſhould I be induced, I ſay, to venture myſelf into the company of men, of whom I have hitherto always been horribly afraid, being frightened at the idea of having the National Eſtabliſhment blown up, as one of them ſaid, clergy and all: can your Lordſhip afford me protection and ſafety? Can your Lordſhip ſhew me, that our days are ſo evangelical, that the lamb may now dwell with the wolf in ſafety? I ſee your Lordſhip is ready kindly to allay my fears; and to demand, if perſons aſſociating for the *ſimple* and *pure* purpoſe of diſſeminating the Scriptures, ought to be ſuſpected of ſuch views and projects? My Lord, ſince I have been a ſhepherd, I have ſeen ſo many wolves, and have undergone ſuch terrors for my poor ſheep, that you muſt have the charity to pity my weakneſs, and excuſe my unconquerable fears. Thoſe who are old in the buſineſs, have a right to be attended to, in matters which concern their experience. Wolves, my Lord, our great Maſter has warned us, ſometimes put on ſheep's clothing; and we find, I aſſure you, much harder work with theſe crafty beaſts, than with thoſe, which, without diſguiſe, prowl about in their proper character. But have I not too good reaſon to be afraid of thoſe who openly, and fairly *avow*, that their object is to eat us up, both ſheep and ſhepherd too? In plain terms, if your Lordſhip can demonſtrate to us, that thoſe perſons with whom you invite me to aſſociate, under pretence of doing God ſervice, have at any time really revoked their hoſtility to the church and miniſtry, which they have ſo frequently, and ſo fully avowed; ſhew us the time when, and the place where, they have deliberately recanted their well-known threats and projects, repented of their numerous ſlanders and calumnies, and have as ſolemnly ſworn peace with the church and clergy, as before they have ſworn and purſued their enmity. Nay, my Lord, I aſk no unreaſonable thing; if you can only ſhew, that upon this preſent occaſion alone, they have explicitly and ſolemnly put off their old man of hoſtility and hatred, and have put on the new man of peace, and love, and concord—I am ſilent, I requeſt your ſecretary will pleaſe to inſert my name, and accept my donation. But, my good Lord, if the enmity of theſe men has never been revoked; if their hoſtility, and deſtructive reſolutions have never been cancelled; if no proof to the contrary can be adduced, but we are ſtill left in poſſeſſion of the thouſand well-known proofs; nay, in many places, of the open confuſion of their intentions of undermining and deſtroying both church eſtabliſhment and clergy too: I then will leave it to any perſon of ſane intellect to determine, whether it be prudent, whether it be upright, whether it be ſafe, to accept your Lordſhip's propoſal."

For our part, we are ſimple enough to deſcry much ſolidity in theſe objections, and to partake of theſe apprehenſions. But not ſo, our *Sub-urban* Clergyman, whom, from the appellation which has been aſſumed, we, at firſt, miſtook for the Rev. Rowland Hill, for the round-

round-houſe in Black Friar's Road is, properly, in the ſuburbs of the metropolis, while the church of Fulham, cannot, by any flight of imagination, be placed in ſuch a ſtate of approximation to London, as to juſtify the denomination of Sub-urban. *He*, clad, no doubt, in the ſtrong armour of faith, and fortified, as it were, with the confidence of *an experienced elect*, conſiders ſuch objections as the mere chimeras of a viſionary brain, and ſuch apprehenſions as the diſtorted offspring of a childiſh imagination. *Ridicule* is the very *appropriate* weapon which he has ſelected for the purpoſe of attack upon his reverend adverſary, and, it cannot be admitted that he has diſplayed as much ſkill in the uſe of it, as judgment in the choice. The Country Clergyman having obſerved that Lord Teignmouth, by accepting the preſidency of this motley Society, had "beſtowed his patronage and protection upon every deſcription of the Church's Enemies," his opponent takes advantage of this broad accuſation, and, after ſome pert and flippant remarks, by way of proemium, thus begins his attack.

"Now here I doubt the accuracy of your repreſentation: I am ſtrongly inclined to think that you do not mean to affirm quite ſo much as you ſay. The church's enemies are ſo numerous, and ſome of them ſo little known, that I think it very probable many deſcriptions could be mentioned, which have never obtained a place in your enumeration. I have *your* authority for ſetting down all the individuals who diſſent from the church's communion as her decided enemies, for they wiſh a man to blow up the national eſtabliſhment, 'clergy and all:' you know they do—'*one* of them ſaid' ſo. Such evidence as this, to be ſure, muſt not for a moment be queſtioned; though I ſhould have thought better of it, if your informer had ſhewn his inſtructions for ſaying ſo much in the name of the reſt. But if I concede to you that *theſe* are the church's enemies, I cannot admit, what I ſuſpect you wiſh to imply, that these are the *only* enemies with which ſhe has to contend. What think you of 'thoſe men of influence and conſideration, who continue to revile the church, and ſtill think proper to remain nominal members of her community?' Into what claſs do you throw thoſe 'men of the world, who in their ſober moments, think it more creditable to be accounted members of our venerable church, than a ſubſcriber to the meeting-houſe?' And laſtly, where do you place thoſe partiſans, whether prieſts or laymen, who, while they contend for the church as the 'chaſte ſpouſe of Chriſt,' confound moſt unwittingly both her pretenſions and her character, with thoſe by which that ſpiritual harlot is known, who has committed fornication with the kings of the earth? For my part, I recogniſe among ſuch *falſe friends* as the two firſt deſcriptions, and ſuch *injudicious advocates* as the laſt, ſome of thoſe enemies, from which the church has moſt to fear. But I think I do you no injuſtice when I ſay, that it does not ſeem to have been your intention to include ſuch characters as theſe within thoſe 'deſcriptions of the church's enemies,' upon which his Lordſhip is blameable for having beſtowed his patronage and protection."

There certainly is an appearance of *diſhoneſty* at the beginning of this paſſage, when the author ſays, in alluſion to the general charge, comprehending *every deſcription* of the Church's enemies, "I am *ſtrongly inclined to think* that you do not mean to affirm quite ſo much

as you ſay;" becauſe he muſt have *poſitively known* that the Country Clergyman did not mean to go ſo far; ſince, in the 11th page of his pamphlet, he expreſsly ſays, " Your Society is compoſed of not only many ſecret foes, and treacherous familiar friends, but of *a very large proportion* of ſworn enemies of the Church;" thus modifying and limiting his previous remark, which modification and limitation, an honeſt adverſary was bound to adopt, as his true meaning.—Our readers will decide, with both paſſages before them, what authority this Sub-urban gentleman has for his ſubſequent remarks. The Country Clergyman has no where ſaid that all the diſſenters to a man wiſh to blow up the national eſtabliſhment " Clergy and all" becauſe " *one* of them ſaid ſo." But he had very good reaſon for ſuſpecting that *ſome* of the members of this new Society entertained ſuch a wiſh, particularly when the brother of the man who publicly proclaimed it to the world is one of them. On what the Sub-urban Clergyman founds his ſuſpicion that his adverſary means to imply that the profeſſed diſſenters are the *only* enemies of the Church, when he expreſsly ſtates the contrary, when he ſpeaks of her " many ſecret foes, and treacherous familiar friends," we are at a loſs to conceive. Certainly on nothing which his addreſs contains. And, if it were not an invidious taſk to mention names, we could, in anſwer to his pert interrogatories, anſwer, that ſuch enemies as thoſe whom he deſcribes are to be found in the Society's liſt.

The Rhapſody of the Sub-urban Clergyman, continued from p. 7, to p. 12, is almoſt undeſerving of notice. He garbles the quotations from his adverſary's book, and, in a moſt unwarrantable manner, aſcribes to him ſentiments which he does not entertain. Of this a notable inſtance occurs in p. 11, where he makes the Country Clergyman ſay, that the preſent intentions of all the members of the Society are good; that he does not even *ſuſpect* them of being wilfully nefarious and that if his Lordſhip can give him the ſecurity which he requires, for the maintenance of its original intentions, he thinks the Society will be what it propoſes, and that he ſhall be proud to rank his name, and make exertions under his Lordſhip's protection. This is a moſt groſs and ſcandalous miſrepreſentation of his adverſary's ſentiments, as will be ſeen from the paſſage from which he draws his inference, and which, being ſhort, we ſhall lay before our readers.

" My Lord, give me leave to ſay, you cannot anſwer for the *real* object of any aſſociation, but by being able to anſwer for the *real* principles and purſuits of its individual members; you may heartily wiſh, and ſincerely endeavour to promote the *avowed* object of this ſociety; (and I know no man more likely to do both than your Lordſhip.) Secure thoſe principles, be able to controul thoſe purſuits, and no man who knows your Lordſhip's high character, would heſitate a moment to believe that your ſociety will be what it propoſes. If Lord T. will pledge himſelf that the ſix hundred members of his ſociety are, like himſelf, honourable and upright men, who ſpeak what they mean, and practiſe what they profeſs; who abhor duplicity and deceit, and know no diſcordance between the object they

profeſs,

profeſs, and the object they *purſue*;—if Lord T. can aſſure me this, I ſhall be proud to rank my name and make exertions under his protection. If this he cannot do, at leaſt let him tell me where is my ſecurity that my contribution to the inſtitution, will not be turned to ſupport ſome object, which I never intend to ſupport; and to promote not the object propoſed to me in the letter, but another, and perhaps a deteſted one? Your preſidency, my Lord, is not exactly of the ſort to which you have been accuſtomed, and which you have ſo much adorned. But far be it from me to ſay, that you preſide over an aſſociation of men, combined for deſigns altogether bad; that you patronize, and protect a ſociety, whoſe objects and principles are wilfully nefarious: All that I here aſſert, is this; that your Lordſhip, for whoſe head and heart I have the higheſt reſpect, appears to have undertaken the patronage of you know not whom or what; and, confident in your own good intentions, you have recommended me to do the ſame."

The next objection of the Country Clergyman appears to us leſs ſolid than moſt of his other objections. It goes to eſtabliſh this point, that as Bibles diſtributed by Papiſts and by Sectariſts, will be employed to ſanction the peculiar tenets of the reſpective donors, they ought not therefore to be ſo circulated at all. Though we admit the premiſes, we cannot adopt the concluſion; we cannot wiſh to reſtrain the circulation of Bibles, becauſe their ſenſe may be perverted or their doctrine miſapplied. It is like an argument ex abuſu ad uſum. Let Papiſts, Socinians, Baptiſts, and Quakers, circulate the Scriptures as they will among their reſpective followers, but let not the Prelates, Divines, and ſound Members of the Church of England, aſſociate with men of ſuch diſcordant principles, for the attainment of an object, which can be better attained by other means, without giving encouragement to the Enemies, or offence to the Friends of the Church. On *this* point, we think the Sub-urban Clergyman has the advantage of his opponent. But in every other point, notwithſtanding his ſelf-ſufficient tone of triumph and exultation, he completely fails.

The Country Clergyman proceeds to conſider the rules and internal conſtruction of the New Society, which he proves to be highly favourable to the adverſaries of the Church, who can ſcarcely fail to have a conſtant preponderance, and to enſure a majority on every queſtion ſubmitted to the diſcuſſion of the members. He then makes the following remarks on this motley aſſociation, which, to be ſure, exhibits as complete a piece of patch-work as Harlequin's jacket.

"Nor is the Church more likely to gain any thing to her dignity by her new aſſociates, than to her intereſt. It is propheſied in Scripture, as a comfort to the Church, that one day ſhe ſhould have 'Kings for her nurſing Fathers, and Queens for her nurſing Mothers.' Your Lordſhip holds out nothing of this ſort in your Society. It cannot be denied that a few nobility are found in your liſt, and ſome other folk of high rank, but of ſuch a deſcription as we ſhould not have expected to find there. But, my Lord, as it is not the mere preſence of a nobleman that can make the company which he honours with his preſence, either creditable or polite, ſo I preſume at once, that I am not required to conſider your Aſſociation as a creditable one, merely becauſe I find at its head your Lordſhip, and a

few

few other reſpectable names. For when I caſt my eye downwards to the motley liſt of Subſcribers, I find ſuch names as can certainly reflect no credit upon the Church. There I recognize the diſſenting teacher, the methodiſt preacher, the preaching blackſmith, &c, who can make but awkward nurſes of the Church. But one thing is plain, that although *our* credit will be no gainer by the company you propoſe, it is not ſo with *them*. If we may take their account of themſelves, their doctrines and communications have hitherto been confined chiefly to the inferior ranks. If your Society ſucceeds, it will be a Society for 'bettering their condition;' a thing to them, it may be preſumed, by no means unpleaſant or ineligible. The Scriptures promiſe to none called Chriſtians but in the Church; and hiſtory proves that none but the Church have enjoyed the ſplendor and favour of Princes. If, therefore, theſe ſeveral denominations have not, and cannot procure the nurſing of Kings and Queens, is it to be wondered at that they ſhould be glad to ſhare the partiality of a Nobleman or two? the benign influence of ſome wandering ſtar?"

The Author of the Addreſs having declared his inability to comprehend the meaning of 'a *liberal* baſis;' his Sub-urban opponent affects to be witty and pleaſant, (and his wit and pleaſantry, be it remembered, is *truly ſub-urban*), and favours us with the following expoſition and illuſtration of the epithet objected to:

"I am really ſorry, Sir, you were ſo much at a loſs to interpret the meaning of that 'liberal baſis,' upon which his Lordſhip recommended the Society to your notice. The terms 'broad bottom,' which you ſubſtitute in their place, would have expreſſed well enough his Lordſhip's intention; but as he was writing to a *Country Clergyman*, and not to 'a preaching blackſmith,' he would not 'fail in the reſpect' that is due to 'a gentleman and a Chriſtian.'—'Thoſe who are uſed to good company (you ſay) know how to behave.' What then is his Lordſhip to think of *you*, when you tell him, that you have 'not been educated on liberal-baſis'd or broad-bottomed principles,' but that either you have not put on your prettieſt behaviour, or that you would 'feel' leſs 'uneaſy,' than you pretend, in that claſs of company to which, as a member of the Bible Society, you would expect to be introduced?

"But were there no other authorities to which you could have recourſe, when the lexicographer failed you, than the mouths of the '*vulgar?*' I have an authority before me, which throws ſo much more light upon his Lordſhip's 'liberal baſis,' than either the ſynonyms of the 'lexicographer,' the ſlang of the 'vulgar,' or the etymological quirks of the 'Country Clergyman,' that I ſhall make no apology for producing it:

"'Give us all grace, to put away from us all rancour of religious diſſenſion, that they who agree in the eſſentials of our moſt holy faith, and look for pardon through the merits and interceſſion of the Saviour, may, notwithſtanding the differences upon points of doubtful opinion, and in the forms of external worſhip, ſtill be united in the bonds of Chriſtian charity, and fulfil thy bleſſed Son's commandment, of loving one another as he hath loved them.'—*Form of Prayer for the Faſt, October*, 19, 1803.

"Now here, Sir, I found that 'liberal baſis' upon which the Society is erected, and I am ſurprized you did not think of looking for it in the ſame place. But perhaps the liberal baſis of the Prayer, like that of the Society,

'has

"has no charms for *you*. I will not preſume ſuch a fact: but if you were to affirm that it is ſo, I ſhould have very little difficulty in believing you."

Now, with all due deference to this dogmatical Cenſor, notwthſtanding the *meaning* which he has been pleaſed to aſcribe to the word *liberal*, and on which we ſhall have a word or two to ſay to him, that adjective applied to the ſubſtantive *baſis*, is neither more nor leſs than *downright nonſenſe*; he might, with equal propriety, be told of a *ſober* baſis and a *drunken* baſis, a *ſalt* baſis and a *freſh* baſis, as of a *liberal* baſis. It is a curious mode of juſtifying the uſe of an improper word, by aſcribing to it an arbitrary meaning, which was never aſſigned to it before, and which it cannot poſſibly bear! Indeed we have long been diſguſted with the indiſcriminate application of this ſame word, which has become a kind of *faſhionable ſlang*, uſed like faſhionable oaths, in different and even oppoſite ſenſes, but, moſt frequently employed to ſignify a perfect indifference to all eſtabliſhed forms and fixed principles. But this flippant gentleman, in the eagerneſs of his wit, and the ebullition of his pleaſantry, has here overſhot his mark, in endeavouring to juſtify an unjuſtifiable expreſſion, has—will he pardon us for uſing a vulgariſm, to a Gentleman and Chriſtian?—let the Cat out of the bag. He has not only ſhewn the origin of the Society, by the paſſage which he has quoted from the Faſt Prayer, but has explained the meaning which *he* at leaſt attaches to ſuch paſſage itſelf.

Our readers will recollect, that, on the appearance of the Faſt Prayer in queſtion, we ſingled out this very paſſage as highly objectionable; and we ſtated our objections to it, with that deference which we ſhall ever pay to our ſpiritual ſuperiors; but at the ſame time, with that earneſtneſs which we conceived became us as ſound and zealous members of the eſtabliſhed Church. For this we were violently cenſured by ſome *liberal* Churchmen, but we had the ſatisfaction to ſee that our obſervations were not thrown away, for the paſſage was wholly omitted, in the next Faſt Prayer! We ſhall not here repeat thoſe obſervations, which our readers cannot have forgotten; but we may be allowed to expreſs our ſurprize, that this ſame paſſage ſhould have been ſelected as the *baſis* of a new Bible Society; and that a man ſhould be found poſſeſſed of ſufficient aſſurance to cenſure a Clergyman for finding *no charms* in ſuch a paſſage. If we underſtand the Gentleman, the new Society was founded on the principle of receiving all perſons as Members "who agree in the eſſentials of our moſt holy faith," and indeed this muſt be his meaning, or he has no meaning at all. Now it is admitted on both ſides, that among the Members are *Socinians* and *Quakers*; either, then, our Sub-urban critic muſt acknowledge that the principles and tenets of theſe Sectariſts are not at variance with "the eſſentials of our moſt holy faith," or he muſt allow, that the Society has eſſentially deviated from the acknowledged principle of its eſtabliſhment. He is not to be told that Socinus and his followers expreſsly deny the doctrine of the Trinity; and

that

that Fox and his followers positively reject the Sacraments which Christ instituted, and are more than suspected of denying his Divinity also. He must then admit, either that the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Divinity of our Saviour, are not among the essentials of our faith; or that the Bible Society is not founded, as he has asserted, upon that Prayer which requires an agreement in essentials as the condition of the bond union. Indeed this appears to us to be the grossest libel upon that Prayer that was ever uttered by man! With what propriety *Socinians* and *Quakers*, who certainly do *not* "look for pardon through the merits and intercession of our SAVIOUR," can be classed among the different denominations of *Christians*, we are unable to say, though no doubt the superlative sagacity and acuteness of the Sub-urban Clergyman would enable him to explain very satisfactorily, at least, to *himself!*—Of such Sectarists we shall observe, at the risk of being termed *illiberal*, "as they often call themselves Christians, without believing the Doctrines of Him by whose name they are distinguished; so is it too customary to believe without examination and conviction, and to be convinced without practising!"*

The Sub-urban Clergyman, triumphantly answers the question put by his adversary, who, having observed that the Dissenters of various kinds had often united *against* the Church, asks when they were known to unite *with* the Church, by gravely stating that they have so united in arming against the common enemy during the present war. Did we conceive this writer to be so incorrigibly stupid as really to believe that this is an answer to his opponent's question, we should consider him a fit object only of contempt. But he must know, that an union for the defence of the lives and property of all its members, cannot be the kind of union to which his adversary refers. We learn from history, that dissenters have united to overthrow the altar and the throne; but when did they unite for the specific purpose of preserving either, from the attacks of its destructive enemies? The object of the enemy against whom they have now united is not to overthrow the established constitution of this realm, in Church and State, but to annihiliate the country, to seize all public and private property, and to extirpate, without distinction of sects, the very population itself. Certainly the Crown and the Altar will be preserved by a successful resistance to such an enemy, but surely it cannot be contended that these are the specific, or even the main objects, for which the dissenters take up arms; self-preservation is the first law of nature, and to that the most vindictive opponents will readily sacrifice their private animosities and feuds, however inveterate they may be. We have not stated this with a view to impeach the motives of any description of men, who have taken up arms, during the present war, but solely for the purpose of shewing the gross fallacy of

* Squire's "Indifference for Religion inexcusable." P. 2.

this

this writer's argument, to which he has devoted three or four pages of the moſt ſuſtian declamation which we ever read.

We have already proceeded ſo far with our analyſis, that we are conſtrained to ſtop, without noticing many other objectionable paſſages in the letter;—the writer of which expreſſes a hope that the evils apprehended by his opponent from the exiſtence of a majority of diſſenters in the Society, will be averted by a conſiderable acceſſion of members of the eſtabliſhed Church. In this hope, we cannot concur, nor in the wiſh which it implies. And we feel tolerably certain that it will not be fulfilled. Indeed, we underſtand, that, in conſequence of the Country Clergyman's addreſs, contemptible as it appears to his arrogant adverſary, a moſt reſpectable nobleman, whoſe name had, without his permiſſion, been inſcribed on the liſt of Vice-preſidents of the Society, has written a letter, expreſſive of his diſapprobation, to the Preſident, and deſired that his name might be withdrawn, not only from the liſt of Vice-preſidents, but from the liſt of Subſcribers alſo. And we have little doubt that his lordſhip's example will be followed in this inſtance, as it would be happy for ſociety if it were followed in all others; for a more ſtaunch friend to religion and morals exiſts not in the world.

In concluſion we ſhall obſerve that the ſtyle of the Country Clergyman, is plain, ſimple, and unaffected; while that of his opponent is marked by a petulance, pertneſs, and flippancy, not very compatible with the grave character of a clergyman, and certainly moſt unſuitable to the ſubject; which is one of importance to all ſerious Chriſtians, and which ought, therefore, to be diſcuſſed with ſoberneſs and dignity.

A Sermon occaſioned by the Death of the late Rev. Dr. Joſeph Prieſtley, delivered in the diſſenting Chapel in Monkwell-ſtreet, on Sunday Evening, April 15, 1804. By John Edwards. 8vo. Pp. 48. Johnſon. 1804.

IF Dr. Prieſtly's aſhes had been ſuffered, by his friends, to lie undiſturbed; if, contented with the fame, ſuch as it was, which he enjoyed during his life, they had allowed oblivion to produce its natural effects on his memory; if they had not moſt officiouſly, impertinently, and injudiciouſly, placed him again on the public ſtage, as the beſt of men, as a martyr, and, indeed, as little leſs than a pattern of perfection, and laſtly, if they had not moſt falſely repreſented him as the herald of truth, and as a model for the imitation of mankind; we ſhould have felt but little diſpoſition to render either him or his writings once more the ſubject of animadverſion or attack. But if the blind zeal of his partiſans will bring him forward to public view, and give the friends of Church and State a public challenge to diſcuſs his merits, it would be cowardice, it would be a groſs dereliction of duty not to accept it. Mr. John Edwards is the hero who has ſo valiantly thrown down the gauntlet on the preſent occaſion.

ſion. Who he is, we have no means of aſcertaining from this Sermon, except that he is, at leaſt an occaſional preacher at a diſſenting Chapel. Whether or no he be the Mr. Edwards *an Unitarian* who keeps a large ſchool in the vicinity of London, at which he liberally provides an uſher of the eſtabliſhed Church for the accommodation of ſuch youths as are not yet initiated into the myſteries of Unitarianiſm, we know not;—but it matters little who the preacher is; our preſent buſineſs is with his Sermon. The firſt ten pages of this diſcourſe are filled with a metaphyſical rhapſody, about matter and inanimate nature which is beneath criticiſm, though it leads to the following notable and *novel* diſcovery.

" But all the intellect in this world (at leaſt all that we are acquainted with) is connected with matter. That portion of organized matter which contains the greateſt portion of mind, of intellect, muſt by us be conſidered as of the greateſt intrinſic value. Now it is agreed on all hands that the greateſt portion of intellect in any race of living beings that we know of in the world, is poſſeſſed by the human race. The human race, therefore, is of the greateſt inportance, of the higheſt intrinſic value, of any created exiſtences that we can properly be ſaid to know of, or have commerce with."

" That's vaary new," Sir Archibald Macſarcaſm would ſay. But this is not the only novelty with which Mr. Edwards has preſented us. He aſſures us that vice " is the only object of cenſure and blame." Now, in the eſtimation of our preacher, a man may deny his Redeemer, and renounce his doctrine, and yet be a perfectly good and virtuous man, and therefore no proper object of cenſure or blame! And ſuch a man was the object of his panegyric whom he pronounces to be " *a truly religious and virtuous man*" ! ! ! Our readers will not forget, that this truly religious and virtuous man reckoned the *Atonement*, the *Incarnation*, and the *Trinity* as ſome of thoſe leading *corruptions of Chriſtianity*, which, in his anſwer to Paine's Age of Reaſon, he told the world, ſhould he " omit no fair opportunity of reprobating in the ſtrongeſt terms."

It is not till the twenty-fifth page that the hero of the piece make his appearance on the ſtage. From the faint ſketch, or rather outline of his life, which Mr. Edwards has pourtrayed, we learn that Dr. Prieſtley was born on the 24th of March 1733, at Briſtall fields head near Leeds in Yorkſhire; his parents, we ſuppoſe, were Calviniſts for his panegyriſt, in his uſual bombaſtic and circumlocutory manner, obſerves that they were " of that perſuaſion in point of religious ſentiment which is termed Calviniſtic." He was educated at a diſſenting college, at Daventry, which he left at the age of twenty-two, when he became preacher at a meeting-houſe at Needham-market, in Suffolk, from which, as his biographer aſſures us, he was obliged " by the unenlightened zeal of his *orthodox* friends" to remove on account of his detection of certain miſtakes in the creed of Calvin, or, as we ſhould ſay, on account of his rejection of ſom

of the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity, for, we conclude he alludes (his delicacy, no doubt, forbade him to be explicit) to his impious renunciation of the Chriſtian doctrines of the *Atonement*, the *Incarnation*, and the *Trinity*. He then went to Namptwich, in Cheſhire, where he officiated ſome time, as paſtor; and afterwards became tutor to the famous diſſenting ſeminary at Warrington, in Lancaſhire. He was thence removed to Mill-hill in Yorkſhire, where he again acted in the capacity of a diſſenting miniſter, and remained till he accepted an invitation from that "ſkilful and enlightened ſtateſman," the Marquis of Lanſdown, with whom he reſided ſeven years.

In 1780, he went to ſettle at Birmingham, with the view of purſuing his philoſophical ſtudies, but, he ſoon became miniſter of the new meeting in that town.

"In this ſituation he continued till July one thouſand ſeven hundred and ninety-one, when he was driven thence, by the moſt diſgraceful riot, that ever happened in this, or, perhaps, all the circumſtances being duly conſidered, in any other country.

"Yes, the broad blot of this infamy muſt remain to tarniſh the annals of the Engliſh nation; for hiſtory, impartial hiſtory muſt relate, that toward the cloſe of the eighteenth century, many of the moſt virtuous and uſeful members of of the community of Great Britain were oppreſſed, and perſecuted without ſympathy from the multitude and majority of their countrymen. Truth and fact will compel the reluctant hiſtorian to place it upon conſpicuous record, that a moſt diſtinguiſhed individual, no leſs illuſtrious for virtue than for ſcience, had his houſe and laboratory burnt to aſhes, his learned labours deſtroyed, his family diſperſed, his name execrated, his very blood thirſted for, in the heart of a country, which he had endeavoured through life to ſerve in every way that benevolence, ſcience, and uprightneſs could point out, or a moſt clear and profound underſtanding, moſt various and extenſive knowledge, and a moſt enlightened, active, and penetrating genius could deviſe.

"If I were to enter into a minute recital of his ſufferings on this occaſion, I ſhould take up too much of your time. Never, ſaid a gentleman to me, ſpeaking of the moment in which ſeparated from his wife and children, this illuſtrious fugitive, though ſeeking perſonal ſhelter from the rage of his enemies, expreſſed neither grief nor anxiety, excepting only on their account — Never did I ſee greatneſs ſo diſtreſſed!"

Mr. Edwards muſt bear to be told that he here either diſplays the moſt conſummate ignorance, or, promulgates the moſt deliberate falſhood. We leave him to ſettle the matter between his head and heart, that is not our province;—but it is our province to tell him, that he has ſaid the thing which *is not*. It would have been more honeſt, if he had informed us, *who* theſe *virtuous and uſeful* members of the community were, and *what* was the *perſecution* and *oppreſſion* which they experienced at the cloſe of the eighteenth century. But we think we can ſave him the trouble, and believe that we can ſupply his deficiencies. Dr. Prieſtley himſelf, in the preface to his farewel ſermon, preached, we believe, at Hackney, thus vents his doleful

complaints

complaints—" I am not unaffected by the unexampled puniſhments of Mr. *Muir*, and my *friend* Mr. *Palmer*, for offences, which, if in the eye of reaſon they be any at all, are ſlight, and *very inſufficiently proved*. But the ſentence of Mr. *Winterbotham*, for delivering from the pulpit *what I am perſuaded he never did deliver*, and which, ſimilar evidence might have drawn down on myſelf has ſomething in it ſtill more alarming." Whether a conſciouſneſs of deſerving the ſame fate led this irreverend calumniator, thus to libel our laws, and charge judges, juries, and evidence, with wilful perjury; as well as to undertake the defence of theſe ſeditious convicts, and the laudable taſk of *ſoftening* their crimes ſo as to give them the ſemblance of virtues, we are not qualified to ſay; but there can be very little doubt that theſe convicts are the ſame worthies, whom the doctor's modeſt panegyriſt moſt modeſtly repreſents to us, " the moſt virtuous and uſeful members of the community of Great Britain;" and that their *trial* and *conviction* conſtitute the *oppreſſion* and *perſecution* which he ſo pathetically laments. As Mr. Edwards repreſents theſe men as the *moſt virtuous* of men, and as Dr. Prieſtley (whom he echoes) appears to have entertained much the ſame opinion, we have here a pretty tolerable ſtandard of *Unitarian virtue*.

In reſpect of the riots at Birmingham, no man can reprobate theſe and all other outrageous proceedings, no man can execrate a mob in all its conſtituent parts, character, and efforts, more ſtrongly than we do. But here again Mr. Edwards perverts the truth, in echoing the falſhoods of his hero, falſhoods which have been confuted again and again. But for the licentious proceedings of Dr. Prieſtley's friends, there had been no mob and no riot. They would meet to celebrate the murderous orgies of revolutionary France, and to inſult every honeſt and loyal man in the town, though repeatedly warned of the conſequences, and therefore they were the cauſe of the violence which enſued, and were, to a certain extent, morally reſponſible for the conſequences. The aſſertion that " his very blood was thirſted for," is a flower of rhetoric that might have been conſiſtently uſed by the patriots of Chalk Farm and Copenhagen Houſe, but was not very becoming in the mouth of a grave preacher, in a place of worſhip. In ſhort, without circumlocution, the aſſertion is at variance with the fact. The doctor's blood was *not* thirſted for. No attempt was made either on his life or on the life of any other perſon. And it would have been but juſt if Mr. Edwards had explained the ſequel; if he had told his audience of the exertions of the magiſtrates and the clergy to quell the riot; of the apprehenſion and trial of eleven of the rioters, ſeven of whom were acquitted; four found guilty, and two of them actually executed; and of the action brought by Dr. Prieſtley againſt the hundred, by which he recovered 2502l. 18s. And is *this*, " the broad blot of infamy that muſt remain to tarniſh the annals of the Engliſh nation?"—Matchleſs impudence! Let us now enquire a little into the truth of another aſſertion advanced by this Unitarian panegyriſt, who tells us that his *illuſtrious ſufferer* " had endeavoured to *ſerve his country* through life in every way that benevolence

benevolence, ſcience, and uprightneſs could point out." Indeed it has been frequently inſiſted, by himſelf and his friends, and with as much gravity as if it were true, that he was attached to the King and Conſtitution of Great Britain. Was it his *benevolence* or his *integrity* that led him, in early life, to write a letter in favour of *Wilkes* and *Liberty?* Was it his *benevolence* or his *uprightneſs* that induced him to write, *at the requeſt of the rebel Franklin*, an addreſs to the Diſſenters, on the approaching war with America, which, according to his own account of it, was *diſtributed in great numbers by his friends, and not without effect?* Which of theſe amiable qualities dictated the following confeſſion, in his letter to the people of Birmingham; —"believe me, the Church of England, which you think you are ſupporting, has received a greater *blow*, by this conduct of yours, than *I* and all MY FRIENDS have ever *aimed at it*"—or this paſſage in his letter to the ſtudents of Hackney, "a hierarchy, equally the *bane of Chriſtianity and rational liberty*; now confeſſes its weakneſs; and be aſſured, that you will ſee its complete reformation, or *its fall.*"* This, Mr. Edwards calls, *ſerving his country*, and thus affords us a tolerable ſpecimen of *Unitarian patriotiſm!*

But this attempt to revile the Engliſh nation for the purpoſe of repairing the broken character of Dr. Prieſtley;—this unwarrantable endeavour, at the expence of decency and truth, to make him paſs for a loyal and good ſubject, a friend to the Conſtitution in Church and State, and to impoſe upon the credulity of the public, in the hope, probably, that no one will take the trouble to examine his writings, or to refer to his paſt conduct, is ſo impudent in its nature, and ſo miſchievous in its *intended* effect, that, with a view to expoſe it, we ſhall enter upon a ſhort retroſpective view of the political diſpoſition of Mr. Edwards's "illuſtrious ſufferer," or, as Peter Porcupine more truly, and more emphatically, calls him, "*Apoſtle of Sedition.*"

Our readers, by referring to the 197th page of our firſt volume will find ſome remarks upon the intercepted letters from the traitor J. H. Stone, at Paris, to Dr. Prieſtley, and his friend and pupil, Mr. Benjamin Vaughan, Mr. Jekyll's predeceſſor, as repreſentative of the independent borough of *Calne*, and fellow-traitor with Mr. Stone, in America. Among other things, we obſerved, on one of Dr. P.'s diſſenting brethren who wrote in the Analytical review; "he labours very hard to convince the public, that whatever may be the contents

* "And yet he has the aſſurance to tell the people of Birmingham, that their ſuperiors have deceived them in repreſenting him and his ſect as the enemies of Church and State." See Mr. Cobbet's Obſervations on Prieſtley's Emigration, which contains much excellent matter, illuſtrative of the Doctor's character, which we ſtrenuouſly recommend to the attentive perual of Mr. Edwards, who will find the tract in the firſt volume of Porcupine's works.

of the letters to Dr. Prieſtley, there no is reaſon to ſuppoſe that the ſentiments which they diſplay are conformable with thoſe of the Doctor. The public, however, we apprehend, will judge otherwiſe, and will conclude with us, that when two perſons congratulate a third, who is their friend and correſpondent, on any particular event, they have good reaſon for knowing that ſuch congratulations will be agreeable to the perſon to whom they are addreſſed."

When the intercepted letters were republiſhed in America, in Porcupine's Gazette, the Doctor wrote to the proprietor of it on the ſubject, but took ſpecial care not to go ſo far as his *critical* partiſans in England;—he did not dare to deny that the ſentiments of thoſe were conformable with his own; but confined himſelf to this cautious and qualified remark "*I am not anſwerable for what he, or any other perſon, may think proper to write to me.*" This jeſuitical evaſion extorted ſome ſpirited animadverſions from Peter Porcupine; which are to be found in the ninth volume of his works. Two or three of them we ſhall extract, as conducive to our purpoſe of placing the *loyalty* of this Birmingham martyr, in a true point of view.

"The preface to his farewel Sermon at Hackney, which was evidently intended as an appeal from the people of England to the people of America (or rather from the impartial judgment of the former to the prejudices of the latter), and which he took good care to publiſh, and to diſtribute in great profuſion, immediately upon his arrival at Philadelphia, is a *moſt malignant libel on the whole Britiſh nation. The King is repreſented as a deſpot; their legislators as corrupt, their clergy as idolatrous, bigoted, and perſecuting; their judges as unmerciful and partial; their juries as perjured; and the people at large, as ignorant, profligate, baſe and cruel.*

"His letter to a friend in England, which was publiſhed there in all the manufacturing towns, and which was evidently intended to be ſo publiſhed in order to induce people to emigrate; that letter, of which every ſentence and every member of a ſentence, is an abominable falſhood; that letter which ſays 'here we have *no poor*,' and which was written at the very time that the writer was preaching '*Charity Sermons*' for the relief of *poor Emigrants*' many of whom he, in his Sermon, ſays, if not ſo relieved, '*muſt perish*;' that letter I ſhall paſs over at preſent, becauſe I look upon it as a duty I owe to my countrymen, to give it a ſeparate and ample reply.

"Neither ſhall I ſtop to remark on his echo to the calumnies contained in the New York addreſſes; becauſe, though abundantly wicked, it was in ſome meaſure drawn from him by the only perſons from whom he ever received a cordial reception on this ſide of the Atlantic. But the ſame excuſe (if, indeed, it ought to be admitted as one) cannot be offered in defence of his *malicious 'charity ſermon for the defence of poor emigrants.'* this ſermon, as it is called, which is at once the moſt nonſenſical and nefarious production that was ever ſnuffled forth from the tub of a conventicle he *calls on the Americans to remember that their forefathers, if not they themſelves were* PERSECUTED BY GREAT BRITAIN; *he reminds them of their victorious endeavours in their* LATE HARD STRUGGLE AGAINST *that nation: he tells them the poor emigrants, though at a diſtance,* PRAYED *for their ſucceſs, and* CONTRIBUTED TOWARDS IT IN VARIOUS OTHER WAYS; *and finally he tells them*

that these poor emigrants ARE NOW PERSECUTED AND DRIVEN FROM GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND FOR HAVING BEEN FRIENDS TO THE AMERICAN CAUSE, *and that even wishing well to the liberty and independence of America is a crime that Great Britain will never forgive.*—Atrociouſly falſe as this ſtatement is, its falſhood is loſt in its poiſonous malignity."

There we have a notable inſtance of *Unitarian truth!* But for the farther inveſtigation of this ſubject we muſt refer our readers to Porcupine's works; and return to our own remarks on the *conformity of ſentiment* between the doctor and his correſpondent Stone. The intercepted letters were publiſhed after the Doctor's emigration to America, when his mind was, no doubt, ſoured by diſappointment; but we have, fortunately, the means of ſhewing that the doctor had, *for many years*, been in the habit of correſponding with this ſame traitor Stone, who, he informs us himſelf (in his letter to Peter Porcupine) was "a member of his congregation at Hackney, and a zealous friend of the American and French revolutions,"* that is, of *rebels and regicides*. We are in poſſeſſion of a letter from this man to Doctor Prieſtley, written from Hackney in the year 1790, which breathes preciſely the ſame jacobinical ſpirit, as that which he wrote to him in America eight years afterwards, and affords the ſtrongeſt proof not only of the long continuance and nature of their correſpondence, but of that perfect conformity of ſentiment, without which it could neither have laſted ſo long, nor even have ſubſiſted at all. We ſhall proceed to lay an extract from this letter before our readers.

"I cannot cloſe my letter without congratulating you on the accompliſhment of thoſe great events which have taken place in Europe, ſince I had laſt the pleaſure of ſeeing you; and as the ſame cauſes, under ſimilar circumſtances, produce the ſame events, I congratulate you ſtill more on *what muſt neceſſarily come to paſs*. Short-ſighted as we are, it requires no uncommon degree of ſagacity to foreſee, that *an idiot king, a ſlaviſh hierarchy, a corrupt adminiſtration*, and *the deluſion of the people*, will melt, like ſnow, before the ſun of *truth*, whoſe influence has hitherto been concealed by the miſts of prejudice and error. All this has been done in France. You ſeem to have viewed the revolution with a prophetic eye, many years ſince; and, if I well remember, for I gave the book containing the remark to Monſ. Rabaud St. Etienne, you hold out what conduct the friends of religious freedom, under ſuch circumſtances as have actually happened, would be *compelled* to obſerve. They would indeed be juſtified were the caſe deſperate here, but this is ſo far from being true, that we have cauſe for exultation and triumph. To endeavour to give mental and perſonal liberty to others, *while ourſelves are enſlaved*, is more noble and ſatisfactory than the mere enjoyment of liberty itſelf. A good mind will never enliſt

* To leave no doubt on the ſubject of ſuch conformity of ſentiment, Doctor Prieſtley in this very letter ſtates this admiration of rebels and regicides as "*ſufficiently accounting for his* (Stone) *corresponding with me!!* This is a direct confeſſion that Stone knew the Doctor's ſentiments to be perfectly conformable with his own.

in the number of the perſecuted; and as the great end of our exiſtence is to diffuſe truth and happineſs, we ſhall not anſwer the end of our exiſtence, if we quit the field, and leave error unpuniſhed and injuſtice unoppoſed.—You have done much good; ſuch as ſeldom falls to the lot, and ſuch as rarely coincides with the deſires, of any man. Much yet remains to be done; but if the world ſhould go on to improve in the ſame ratio as it has theſe ten years paſt, (as a body in deſcending acquires force) and I ſee no reaſon to the contrary, you will live to ſee *the accompliſhment of your labours, the ſummit of your wiſhes, the empire of falſehood, religious and political, overthrown,* and *the world free and happy.*

I have the honour to be,
With the higheſt eſteem,
Your very faithful and obedient ſervant,

Hackney, March 11th, 1790. J. H. STONE."

This letter was found among the Doctor's *valuable manuſcripts* at Birmingham, at the time of the riots. It has been in our poſſeſſion ſome time, and would never have ſeen the light but for the officious zeal of his injudicious friend Mr. John Edwards. The friend, by whom it was tranſmitted to us, remarked "as this ſubject is now pretty much at reſt, and the Doctor ſeems haſtening to oblivion, this letter is not likely to come into any uſe; I ſend it you as a literary curioſity." So that the public may thank Mr. Edwards for bringing it to light.

We have, we truſt, exhibited ſufficient proofs to convict Mr. John Edwards of the moſt imprudent falſehood ever uttered by man, in the following paſſage. "Referring to his (Prieſtley's) admiration of the Engliſh Conſtitution," (of which, be it obſerved, the *hierarchy* is an eſſential part) "of King, Lords and Commons, it was *truly* (moſt falſely and blaſphemouſly, *we inſiſt*) "ſaid of him, that, though he was an Unitarian in religion, he was a Trinitarian in politics. This at leaſt was the caſe during his continuance in this country!!!"

Mr. Edwards is not more correct in his account of his hero's reception in America. "At length he thought it adviſable to croſs the Atlantic to North America, where he received the welcome of the late illuſtrious vindicator and eſtabliſher of American freedom, General Waſhington." To this falſe ſtatement, we ſhall oppoſe the true ſtatement of Peter Porcupine, who was an eye witneſs, almoſt, of the Doctor's reception in America. "Soon after Doctor Prieſtley landed at New York, he proceeded on to Philadelphia, where the firſt mortification he met with was *General Waſhington's refuſal to ſee him as a viſitor!* The united Iriſhmen had foretold, that the general would "take him by the hand," but the general wanted to ſcrape cloſe acquaintance with no renegado from England, in regard to which country he was, at that time, very anxious to avoid all ground of offence." *Porcupine's works,* Vol. I. p. 139. In fact, he experienced from the Americans a totally different reception from that which he had flattered himſelf he ſhould experience. When he offered himſelf as candidate for the office of chaplain to Congreſs, he

had, we believe, but a single vote, and only one minister would allow him the use of his pulpit.

We have now enabled our readers to judge what grounds Mr. Edwards has for expecting that "his country, *repentant and grateful*, will inshrine his memory along with that of her noble army of sages, heroes, and *martyrs*; and bid the genius of the sculptor place his monumental honours next to those of Verulam or Newton." Here we have a specimen of *Unitarian modesty*. But we will no longer trespass on the patience of our readers; but conclude with observing that, considered as a literary composition, this discourse is greatly defective; the style is inflated and the manner affected; as a sermon, it is detestable; for, in the temple of truth, it promulgates falshood. We think it necessary, however, to admonish these sectarian preachers, that it ill becomes them thus to abuse the *toleration* which they enjoy in this country; and, that, although the objects of their panegyric may be allowed to impugn, with impunity, the essential articles of our faith, even while the law provides a specific punishment for such conduct, *they* shall never publicly clothe sedition in the garb of loyalty, and call upon us to admire what we ought to abhor, with equal impunity. We will tear the mask from their faces, and expose them and their arts to the public, whom they seek to mislead, pervert, and delude.

THE DRAMA.

The Honey Moon: a Comedy in Five Acts. By the late John Tobin, Esq. 2s. 6d. Longman and Co.

THE fable of this comedy is improbable in the extreme, though some of the situations are novel, and capable of much dramatic effect. There is a barrenness of incident which will render it a *heavy* piece, where it cannot be supported by the most impressive acting, and when the powerful auxiliaries of correct scenery and decoration do not contribute their aid towards the *continuance*, as well as the consistency, of the fiction. There is a vein of poetry runs through the dialogue which renders it a pleasant comedy to read. The language is generally chaste and correct, interspersed with the brilliancy of figure and coruscations of wit.

The School for Reform, or How to Rule a Husband. A Comedy in Five Acts. By T. Morton, Esq. Longman.

THIS comedy derives it name from a weak and imbecile attempt at novelty in a character of little or no consideration in the piece. The fable, in many situations, bears a strong similarity to the author's other productions, &c. and alternately reminds us of "*Speed the Plough*," "*Cure for the Heart Ache*," "*Lovers Vows*," "*Pizarro*," *&c. &c.* It is a kind of made-up-medley of sentiment and singularity, introducing into the same scene, the extremes of vice, virtue, and vulgarity. The character of *Tyke* is the principal relief, though we do not conceive it as conducive to the dignity of the stage, or the improvement of the national morals. A

convict from Botany Bay, practising the same villanies which sent him thither, and rendering himself amusing to the audience by his wit and affected idiotism, is a most melancholy proof of the looseness of the morality which tolerates him, and the poverty of those dramatists who are driven to the necessity of introducing such characters into their productions. Of the plot we can give no analysis from our first reading, and the piece will not bear a second.

The Lady of the Rock, a Drama in Two Acts. By Thomas Holcroft.

THIS story was dramatized at the suggestion of Aikin and Co. in the Annual Review. It consists of a lady being conveyed on a rock to pen for the heavy sin of *barrenness*, but, in conformity to the taste of an Engl audience, *jealousy* is substituted, and the lady, after being carefully tak thither, is as carefully brought back, and the piece *concludes* to the no sm joy of the audience. When *barrenness* becomes a punishable crime in t country, woe to a great portion of our present dramatists and Mess Aikin and Co. into the bargain! The piece affords several good situatio for scenery, but is altogether unworthy the talents of such a writer Mr. Holcroft.

Too many Cooks. A Farce in two Acts.

WRETCHED catering for the public;—but we have *too many cooks!*

POLITICS.

A concise Statement of Facts relative to the Treatment experienced by Sir H Popham, since his return from the Red Sea. 4to. Pp. 144. 2s. Stockdale. 1805.

IN reviewing a pamphlet in our last number, remarkable for the fire of its language, and its professions of independence, we were readily clined to believe that the officer, who appeared as the prominent subje the controversy, had received a treatment very different from that to wh he seemed intitled; and our opinion gained additional weight from a kn ledge of the extreme enmity which certain members of the late cab still bear to such individuals as have ventured to examine their con while in power. An idea that oppression or injustice has been exerc by one set of men towards another, who may happen to be without the mediate means of vindication, is so disgusting to the feelings of an Eng man, that he espouses the cause of the injured party as if it were his o and thus not unfrequently draws upon himself a share of the persecu levelled at those in whose defence he comes forward.—A reviewer sh divest himself of such ardour, which is peculiar to young minds, adhering to the maxim of "*Fiat Justitia*" should examine both sides controversy with the most perfect calmness and impartiality. Of that w has given rise to the pamphlet before us we still know but little. It deed appears to us, more evident, that Sir Home Popham has been unjustly treated; but even in his own pamphlet he leaves the publi gues at the cause of the conduct of the late Admiralty towards him.— the information we gain is, that he sailed in December, 1800, in the Ro with a body of troops for the Red Sea, to join the Indian army on exped

expedition to Egypt; it is therefore evident that he received his appointment at the time Earl Spencer was at the head of our naval affairs. When he returned, he found a new administration, who ordered his ship to be detained in the Downs, and the hands, many of whom had been eight years in the ship, and had nine years pay due to them, to be employed in fitting out other vessels, then preparing for service, in consequence of the termination of the "hollow armed truce" with the usurper of France. The men entered upon this service with alacrity, and their recompense was, that the Admiralty refused to grant them leave of absence to visit their relatives, even for a single day. A commission was also sent down to Chatham, to inspect the repairs done to the Romney, in India, and to make a report of the expenses, the waste of stores, &c. while the order from the Admiralty directed that *the depositions of the warrant officers only* should be taken; by which the testimony of the lieutenants and master of the ship was precluded. The result was a long correspondence between Sir Home Popham and the Secretary to the Admiralty, in which he explains the improvements he had made in the ship, the instructions he had imparted to his officers, &c. and requests that a contrast should be made between the expences of the ships under his command and others repaired at Calcutta; asserting that the latter would be found to *exceed* from one fourth to one half those of the Romney. But all his remonstrances and solicitations were, it seems, of no avail. The Board of Inquiry were ordered to proceed *according to their instructions*; and they made their report. As this subject is about to be discussed in Parliament we shall offer no comments upon it. The report alluded to appears to have given rise to the comments of Æschines, which we reviewed in our last number. The Concise Statement of Facts is filled with documents from Marquis Wellesley, General Baird, Admiral Rainier, and other distinguished characters, all affording the most unqualified testimony of the ardour and abilities of the Commander of the Romney. There are also several interesting letters in this publication relative to the present state of Arabia, which are certainly well worth the notice of those whose commercial views are directed to that quarter of the world.

We should feel much inclined to offer many remarks on the correspondence we have already alluded to, were it not that we do not wish to prejudice that investigation which is so near at hand; and the result of which it requires no great penetration to anticipate.

The Roman Catholic Petition unsanctioned: therefore an Unsafe and Unconstitutional Ground of Emancipation. Pp. 48. 1s 6d. London, Murray. 1805.

THE object of this calm, and well-written pamphlet, is not to urge all the arguments which might be brought forward against granting the demands of the Irish Roman Catholics. The author confines himself to one. He clearly proves that the principles which have hitherto induced the legislature to withold from Roman Catholics some political rights, and which are hostile to a Protestant government, are doctrines of their Church.—That they have been authenticated by the decisions of general Councils, which, to Roman Catholics, is infallible authority—That these decisions remain still unrepealed.—That, therefore, no Roman Catholic individual can, that no assemblage of Roman Catholics can, hold principles in direct opposition to those of the Catholic (as it is called) Church.—

That, for these reasons, the Protestant legislature of this country can place no confidence in the *ostensible* principles of the Irish petition, and, therefore, never can, without a breach of that trust committed to its care, grant the prayer of the petition, until a general council shall have previously reprobated, and expunged from the ecclesiastical code, every hostile law which is the just object of our fear; That we shall then, and not till then, be certain that the subjects in British Isles, though of different religions, have not opposite codes for the guidance of their moral and political conduct.

This, we think, is placing the matter in a new light; and holding out fair and honourable terms to the petitioners. If the Roman Catholic Church complies with this most reasonable demand, the petitioners will obtain all they desire: if it does not comply, can there be a more decisive proof that the hostile principles still remain lurking in the bosom of that Church, and wait only for the fostering warmth of favourable circumstances, to rouse them, as in former times, to the most destructive activity? We insert the following extract as a specimen of the pamphlet.

"I maintain that in a solemn compact between a government and its subjects, such as the Roman Catholic petition tends to establish, the subjects are bound to shew that they derive their powers for fulfilling that compact from the *fountain-head*. This the petitioners have not done. They speak, and can speak to us only for themselves. Their Church, which has ever held different sentiments, and which ought to have spoken, is silent."

"Roman Catholics demand all the rights and privileges of good subjects, setting forth that they *are* so. They demand it of a tribunal, which has full power to grant the boon. But, before this be granted, Protestants, on their side, demand that the authority for the *ostensible* principles of Roman Catholics should be equal to the authority of the tribunal from which they demand redress; that it should be *paramount* and *undisputed*.

"Is not this fair and reasonable?

"Let then that paramount, that undisputed authority, *the church of Rome, in a general council*, clearly and unequivocally reprobate the imputed doctrines. Let it clearly and unequivocally decide, that none of the decrees, &c. which are the objects of our caution and dread, are doctrines of that Church.

"And, to confirm beyond a doubt the sincerity of this procedure, let the council authentically expunge from the canons of the Church every decree of a council; every dictum, bull, &c. of a Pope; every opinion of every canonist; in short every thing whatsoever which has given rise to what Roman Catholics say are groundless, but which we say are well-grounded fears on our part.

"If the existing doctrines of the Church of Rome be really such as they are represented by the petitioners, she will rejoice in the opportunity of sweeping away the accumulations of gross ignorance and the most insatiable ambition; and most certainly can and will have no objection to give, *in this way*, the most full and authentic proof of the truth of what the petitioners advance. A refusal of this test of her *real* doctrines, will place her in the same situation with the revolutionary governors of France, who laid it down as a maxim, that whatever territories they acquired, *per fas, et nefas*, were integral parts of the republic, from which they were never to be disjoined.

"If this, or something equivalent, be not done, all our distrust, every fear, must remain; and, instead of granting the petition, Parliament must confide

conſider the petioners to have ſaid "the thing which is not." The good of the whole is a truſt of which Parliament is the guardian: to this every exertion, every deciſion ſhould be directed: from this it ſhould never turn aſide. Every deviation from this great object is treaſon of the deepeſt dye; it is treaſon againſt the intereſts and happineſs of the people, whoſe intereſts and happineſs are committed to its care. *Bound, therefore, as it is, to ſupport and maintain the Proteſtant religion in the country, and a Proteſtant monarch on the throne, or, in other words, to ſupport the Britiſh conſtitution, it cannot juſtly, or conſtitutionally, or ſafely, grant the prayer of the* UNSCANTIONED ROMAN CATHOLIC PETITION.

A Letter to Dr. Troy, titular Archbiſhop of Dublin, on the Coronation of Buonaparté by Pope Pius VII. By Melancthon. Dublin and London. 1805.

THIS Letter contains much more than its title page holds forth to the public. The writer examines at great length, and reprobates the conduct of the Pope in ſubmitting to the humiliating act of crowning the Corſican Uſurper.

"It is the authority of the Moſt High which he pleads; it is the ſanction of his commiſſion of which he makes his boaſt; it is his higheſt prerogative in governing the affairs of men, that he pretends to exerciſe, while he confers the Imperial crown, the price of all the enormities to which the French revolution gave birth, on its moſt diſtinguiſhed parricide, and anoints with the holy oil of kings the mercileſs hands that ſluiced the moſt innocent blood during its exterminating progreſs.

"It is in the name of the immaculate Jeſus, and with the invocation of the Holy Spirit, that he conſecrates a ſceptre, wreſted from its legitimate poſſeſſors by a ſeries of ſuch atrocities, flowing from this revolution, as never before ſtained the annals of human crimes, or drew down the curſes of heaven on the human race.

"It is the bleſſed Son of God whom he aſſociates in the filiation to which he admits a recorded apoſtate, who in the face of the Chriſtian and infidel world, and by a public proclamation ſent into the world with his ſignature, while commanding the revolutionary armies in Egypt, aſſerted that God had no Son, no aſſociate in his kingdom.

"It is to the grace of God, poured largely into the heart of this ferocious homicide, who by a more inſatiate thirſt of blood, and a pre-eminence in every revolutionary crime, eclipſed the fame of all his revolutionary competitors, that he aſcribes the deſire to receive the Imperial crown, the golden fruit of all theſe crimes, from the hands of God's vicegerent and repreſentative; and it is to the immediate inſpiration of heaven, in anſwer to his own fervent prayers, that he attributes his determination to gratify this deſire of his moſt 'dutiful ſon,' who now profeſſes to be a Catholic, as, when it anſwered a revolutionary purpoſe, he profeſſed to be a Mahometan, and who now venerates the *health-bearing croſs*, as he then venerated the health-adminiſtering Koran.

"With reſpect to the high ſtation he fills as head of the Roman Catholic church, ſeated in the ſee of the Prince of the Apoſtles, and, as his ſucceſſor, venerated, I might ſay adored, by ſuch a portion of the Chriſtian world, I charge him with having betrayed its intereſts and degraded its dignity.

"He canonizes as the pious and zealous protector of that ſee, the man who made a merit with the people of Egypt, that he was the ſervant of their prophet; a Muſſulman, who had marched to Rome to overthrow the Pope, becauſe

becauſe he invited the Chriſtians to make war againſt the Mahometan religion."

To the plea of ſubmiſſion to the ruling powers, as taught by the Apoſtles, he anſwers, by ſhewing that the doctrine taught by the Apoſtles cannot give the ſhadow of a pretext for the act of the Holy Father. To the plea of *neceſſity*, that he was forced into the meaſure, that depoſition, poverty, nay death perhaps would have followed a refuſal—What then was he to do? He anſwers in the words of Corneille's Horatius "Qu'il mourut!" and in thoſe of Cicero, "Nemo juſtus eſſe poteſt, qui dolorem, qui exilium, qui egeſtatem, qui mortem timet, aut qui ea, quæ his ſunt contraria, æquitati anteponit."

The writer vindicates Lord Redeſdale for making a diſtinction between Engliſh and Iriſh Roman Catholics, by proving, from cauſes which he enumerates, that the latter cannot be ſuch good ſubjects as the former. He concludes with propoſing an arrangement, a ſpecies of Concordate between the Iriſh Roman Catholics and Government, which he thinks would have beneficial effects. We are of opinion that neither the Iriſh clergy, nor their foreign head, would conſent to this arrangement, and ſuſpect that it would be inefficient, even could it be realized. The pamphlet would not have ſuffered by conſiderable compreſſion: it is in many places rather declamatory.

Strictures on the Tenth Report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry. By Allan Macleod, Eſq. *To which are subjoined, an Appendix containing the substance of that Report; and Lord Melville's Letter of the 28th of March, 1805, to the Commissioners, together with their Answer.* 8vo. Pp. 96. Ginger. 1805.

THIS is unqueſtionably the beſt of Mr. Macleod's political pamphlets; the ſtyle of it is more correct, and the arguments are more cloſe and connected, than thoſe of his former productions. He has taken up the *unpopular* ſide of the queſtion, and has treated it with conſiderable ability and effect. With his opinion of Lord St. Vincent we heartily concur. He does full juſtice to the courage and ſkill of the *Admiral*, but he arraigns the incapacity of the ſtateſman. In ſhort we have no heſitation in declaring our decided conviction, that this hero of the Whig Club is, beyond diſputation, the very worſt Firſt Lord of the Admiralty, that ever preſided at that board. Indeed, he has no one quality of a ſtateſman in his compoſition, and his mind exhibits ſo many diſguſting deformities, as to counteract the effect of a thouſand good qualities, even if he poſſeſſed them. Here his diſpoſition is pourtrayed in the colours of truth. Arrogant, tyrannical, intolerant, and overbearing, he neither poſſeſſes the art to conciliate eſteem, nor the merit to deſerve it, yet, to read the ſhameleſs panegyrics of his miſerable paraſites, one would ſuppoſe him to be a paragon of perfection, ſent by heaven to preſerve the ſtate. But we have more, much more to ſay of this man, than can be ſaid here; and we ſhall therefore take our leave of him for the preſent with a requeſt to ſome of his panegyriſts to point out which of his admirable profeſſional virtues were diſplayed, in his plan of the memorable expedition to Teneriffe; and which of his mental accompliſhments marked *his reception of the officer who communicated to him the news of its failure?* Verbum ſat. We ſhall be ſufficiently underſtood.

Mr. Macleod alſo attacks, with great force, the Naval Commiſſioners, for their conduct reſpecting the tenth report. And, at the ſame time, pleads ſtrongly in juſtification of Lord Melville. We certainly think Lord Melville

Melville a moſt perſecuted man; and that the proceedings againſt him have been marked by a ſpirit, which we *dare not* characterize. But we have not read the Act of Parliament with ſufficient attention to give a decided opinion on the queſtion, whether Lord Melville has been guilty of a breach of it, or not? And, moſt certainly, we are not diſpoſed to take the Houſe of Commons as our guides, or as interpreters of the law, upon ſuch an occaſion. But, putting that *omnipotent* aſſembly out of the queſtion, for the preſent, we contend that the enemies of Lord Melville have violated the moſt ſacred principles of juſtice and of law, in their proceedings. The ſubject will require ample diſcuſſion; and, at a fit opportunity, it ſhall have it.

We have noticed two or three errors in this tract, which the author will do well to correct, in a future edition.—In p. 18. *principio petitio* is put for *petitio principii*, a miſtake, probably, of the printer. In p. 19. we meet with this propoſition. "*Good intentions* may be *vices* in a miniſter." This is not true; *good intentions* in themſelves are always *virtuous*, but, in a miniſter, they are no excuſe for *bad actions*, nor are they any juſtification of *incapacity*. However good the *intentions* of a miniſter may be, *incapacity* for the ſituation which he holds is *criminal*. We ſuppoſe Mr. Macleod meant no more than this, but his expreſſions do not convey ſuch a meaning.

The horrors of Negro Slavery exiſting in our Weſt Indian Iſlands, irrefragably demonſtrated from Official Documents recently preſented to the Houſe of Commons. 8vo. Pp. 36. 1s. Hatchard. 1805.

Agreeing, as we do, with thoſe who have reſiſted the abolition of the Slave Trade, on the ground both of policy and juſtice, we cannot but expreſs our deteſtation of the atrocities recorded in this pamphlet. The frequent murder of negroes, and the pertinacity of the iſlands in refuſing to affix to that crime the character and puniſhment of felony, call for the reprobation of every honeſt man. Yet we are very far from being led into the popular error of arguing from the *abuſe* of a thing againſt the *uſe* of it; and into this error enthuſiaſm appears to us to have betrayed the violent advocates for the abolition. Whenever abuſes or grievances of any kind are found to exiſt, in the name of juſtice, let them be immediately corrected and removed; but are we to overturn a whole fabric, becauſe there are ſome partial defects in it? *Enthuſiaſm* may ſay *yes*; but reaſon will anſwer *no*.

MISCELLANIES.

Extract from ſome fragments of Notes taken in a Trial in a Court of Quarter Seſſions, as an Appeal againſt an Aſſeſſment for the relief of the Poor, inſcribed to thoſe Friends of the Conſtitution, who wiſh to ſee that Conſtitution preſerved by impartial Juſtice in the Adminiſtration of the Laws. The Second Edition with additional Notes by the Editor; to which is added, a Letter addreſſed to the Editor, by a Friend to Impartial Juſtice. 8vo. Pp. 22. 1s. Blake, Maidſtone. 1804.

AS far as we can collect from theſe fragments, which, for obvious reaſons, ſpeak the language of ambiguity, a clergyman, at ſome village in Kent, was aſſeſſed *twenty pounds* for *one tenth part* of a property, the owner

owner of the other *nine parts* of which was only aſſeſſed at *forty-seven pounds*. This monſtrous inequality appears to have been made the ground of an appeal, and a moſt juſt ground it was; but what the deciſion of the court was we are left to conjecture. We truſt it was ſuch as juſtice required, and as law commanded. The tract contains ſome very juſt and forcible remarks on the hardſhips to which the clergy are expoſed from the weight of the poor rates; and, indeed, we have long conſidered the whole ſyſtem of poor rates, burthenſome as they are now become, as one of the moſt intolerable grievances, under which this nation ever laboured; and we predict, that, without a radical reform, the conſequences will be moſt ruinous.

Flowers of Literature, for 1804: *or, Characteriſtic Sketches of Human Nature and Modern Manners. To which are added, a General View of Literature during that period; Portraits and Biographical Notices of eminent Literary Characters, with Notes, Hiſtorical, Critical, and Explanatory.* By Francis William Blagdon, Eſq. *Author of the Imperial Folio Hiſtory of India. (Publiſhed under the patronage of His Majeſty), &c. &c.* Vol. III. *To be continued Annually.* Small 8vo. Pp. 570. 6s. Boards. Croſby. 1805.

Mr. Prevoſt, it appears, from the preface to the preſent volume of *The Flowers of Literature*, has withdrawn his aſſiſtance from that work. We ſhould not have been aware of this circumſtance, from an examination of the contents of the volume; for we think that it is at leaſt equal, if not ſuperior, to those by which it has been preceded. Indeed, that part of the work which demands the greateſt portion of literary ſkill; we mean the *General View of Literature*, exhibits more traits of originality and taſte than we have been accuſtomed to witneſs.

The biographical ſketches and portraits, prefixed to this volume, are:—the Biſhop of Llandaff; Hayley, the poet; Mrs. Parſons, the noveliſt; Dallas, the author of *The Hiſtory of the Maroons, &c.*; and Cumberland, the dramatiſt.

The Adventures of Cooroo, a Native of the Pellew Islands. By C. D. L. Lambert. Pp. 275. 5s. Scatcherd and Letterman.

MANY writers who have wiſhed to draw a picture of the ſeeming abſurdities and imperfections of civil ſociety have made uſe of the obſervations of a ſuppoſed uneducated ſavage, to introduce their own ſatirical obſervations. Such is the plan of the novel (if it may be ſo called) now before us.

Cooroo, a native of the Pellew Iſlands, receives ſome outlines of education from an Engliſhman of the name of Blanchard, an Engliſhman who ſtaid behind when the crew of the Antelope embarked for their native country. The kind of inſtruction he received is thus deſcribed.

"It ſhould here be obſerved, that Blanchard, though tinged with diſſatisfaction in regard to his own country, merely from being unfortunate in it, was, nevertheleſs, a true patriot, and took great pride in extolling the ſuperior form of government, and ſtrength, of his native country (England) over all others. This prejudice he ſo inſtilled into his pupil, that it could never be eradicated; and to ſuch an extent was it that it embraced not only the government and laws, but the climate, productions, and character of the inhabitants; and, indeed, having been adopted by an Engliſhman, Cooroo determined henceforth to conſider himſelf as ſuch.

"Blanchard,

"Blanchard, who was a bit of a philoſopher, and had no particular religious creed, inſtructed his pupil merely in the great outlines of Chriſtianity, recommending him to get baptized at the firſt Chriſtian Church he came at, in caſe he ſhould ever quit his native iſland. In regard alſo to moral obligations he was equally conciſe: adviſing him, never to do any thing which he thought wrong, whatever might be the plauſible excuſes which his propenſity to do it would readily preſent to his imagination, and to preſerve an unſhaken integrity in every circumſtance that might occur."

Death, however, deprived Cooroo of his tutor, and to ſupply the loſs of his companion, he himſelf became a tutor in his turn to one of his own countrymen, named Boolam, but he was not very happy in his choice, for the author tells us that "Boolam, though a good natured youth, was either void of capacity, or wanted that reſpect which it is neceſſary a pupil ſhould have for his preceptor. He abhorred the ſight of a book, and nothing mortified him ſo much, as when Cooroo retired to read by himſelf. One day, taking advantage of Cooroo's abſence, he burnt his whole library, which, though it conſiſted but of only three or four tattered books, was an irreparable loſs to the owner, who was farther provoked, by Boolam's only laughing at the circumſtance, and ſaying, he was willing to make recompenſe by ſitting and hearing him repeat over what he uſed to ſay to the books. However, what Boolam wanted in inclination to learn, he made up by ability in other reſpects—he was bold and active, and was ſoon a better manager of the boat than Cooroo, notwithſtanding the latter had been inſtructed by Blanchard himſelf."

In one of their aquatic excurſions they are driven out to ſea, and after being toſſed about for ſeveral days without ſeeing land, they are at laſt thrown on a deſart coaſt, inhabited only by monkeys, and one ſolitary Iriſh ſeaman, named Mooney, who had been ſhipwrecked; they are at laſt taken up by a French privateer, and ſhipwrecked on the coaſt of Spain, where the three friends ſeparate, and do not meet again till nearly the concluſion of the tale, the remainder of which is taken up by Cooroo's obſervations and adventures in England and Spain, between which countries the ſcene of action is divided. Why the author ſhould have choſen Spain, with whoſe manners we are comparatively ſo little acquainted, in preference to France or Germany, does not ſeem eaſy to account for, or why he ſhould deſire to loſe the opportunity of contraſting the opinion of two ſuch different characters as Cooroo and Boolam, on the habits and manners of poliſhed life.

On the relief of common beggars by caſual alms we meet with this juſt obſervation. "If you wiſh, ſaid he, to alleviate real miſery, you muſt ſeek out for objects more worthy than thoſe towards whom you have juſt been ſo bountiful. Suffering virtue," added he, "ſhrinks from public view, whilſt the profeſſed beggar, with clamourous invocations, obliges the eye to turn towards a diſguſting exhibition of miſery and infirmities, and is ever on the hunt after credulous charity." He then bid Cooroo farewell, adviſing him to reſerve his wealth for thoſe who were not able to beg for themſelves."

The author chuſes, like many of the ſentimental writers of the time, to be very ſevere on the game laws, but he ſhould have conſidered that Cooroo was full as likely to have run down and killed a tame ſheep which *might* have ſubjected him to tranſportation, as a wild hare which he ought to have known incurred a much milder penalty.

We quote with pleaſure this account of the general effect of dramatic

ſatire

ſatire, and the author's juſt cenſure of a celebrated unprincipled lampooner, for ſurely he does not deſerve the name of ſatiriſt.

"But," obſerved the doctor, "there is much well-pointed ſatire in my performances, and vice is laſhed in them with a whip of ſcorpions." "So much the worſe for you," rejoined the actor, "that wont do at all; for under the appearance of chaſtiſing vicious and profligate characters, they are made thoſe whom the youthful ſpectators with moſt to imitate. A debauchee, for inſtance," continued he, "is repreſented by the beſt performer; and by having generally all the wit and perſonal accompliſhments on his ſide, is looked on as the hero of the piece. The increaſed depravity of morals in every rank," reſumed Buſkin, after a ſhort pauſe, "is a proof that the ſtage has not reformed them. The expoſure of faſhionable follies and diſſipations, only familiarizes the ſpectators to them, and they had therefore much better be left to themſelves." "What then is your opinion of ſatire?" ſaid the doctor to Buſkin, "has it not, do you think, done much public good?" No doubt," replied Buſkin, "but not often to the ſatiriſt; unleſs he ſhould happen to be like that fellow Pindar, a man of no principle nor moderation, who will not ſtick at turning into ridicule the beſt and moſt unexceptionable characters, provided it will fill his own pocket." "Peter Pindar!" repeated the doctor, "I deſpiſe the raſcal as much as you can do; I ſcorn to flatter the vices or even failings of a king, or of any other great man, but I have too much conſcience to allow of my abuſing a talent for ridicule, ſo far as to endeavour to leſſen in the eſtimation of his people, a monarch, who, in theſe depraved times, gives the firſt example of private virtues."

The author has copied two circumſtances from works ſo popular that it was impoſſible for him to eſcape detection. The determination of Cooroo not to part with the gold croſs, given him by Laura, to pay his reckoning, is exactly taken from an incident in Joſeph Andrews, and Barber Pole is a fac ſimile of the Barber of Bagdad in the Arabian Nights.

Though there is much juſt ſatire in this work, we do not approve his mode of decrying the civil and political regulation of a country, becauſe they do not come up to the ideas of an untutored mind, which has been told it was to find them all perfection. In all human inſtitutions, as they are adminiſtered by imperfect agents, there muſt be imperfections and abuſes. And the ſatiriſt ſhould remember, that the works of Omnipotence itſelf are not entirely free from the cavils of ignorant and ſuperficial obſervers.

The Principles of Currency and Exchange, illustrated by Observations upon the State of the Currency of Ireland, the high Rates of Exchange between Dublin and London, and the Remittances of Rents to Irish Absentees. By Henry Parnell, Eſq. 1 Vol. 12mo. Pages 188. Budd. 1805.

THE ſubject of this performance has been very frequently diſcuſſed of late years by commercial politicians, and both the principles and details neceſſarily include much of what has been very often ſtated. The circumſtances that affect the rate of exchange in general, and eſpecially between Britain and Ireland, are very well known to the public. This writer however preſents a clear and perſpicuous ſtatement of what has been often preſented before. His principles are moſtly unexceptionable; but then they have been received before, without exception, from Smith's Wealth of Nations; and the details are commonly to be found in pamphlets and periodical

riodical publications. What the writer aſſerts is uſually, we believe, true; but contains no important acceſſion to political œconomy, or to that particular department of it which he profeſſes to handle. He endeavours to ſhew that Iriſh currency is in a ſtate of degradation, much lower than is natural. The remedy which preſents itſelf to this degradation is caſh payments. This leads into a long diſſertation upon paper money, new to no ſcholar, and tedious from its triteneſs. He goes through the well known details of Scotch and Engliſh banks, and compares them with Iriſh eſtabliſhments of a ſimilar object. Next he proceeds to the effect of private bank paper on the circulating medium; treads ſtep by ſtep a path that was beaten before, and introduces moſt of the obſervations that have of late years been publiſhed on the operation of country banks. All this bears the marks of knowledge of the ſubject, which we doubt not Mr. Parnell has cloſely ſtudied; but it wants novelty, and has really nothing to engage the attention of a reader of any range of acquaintance with finance. A book may be true and ſolid, without informing or intereſting a reader. If a commentator were to write an eſſay upon Homer, and to give the common ſketch of the events and characters, and nothing more, what good is to be derived from his book? The moſt uſeful part of this work appears to be the Appendix, containing official documents; but the whole literary merit of that part is the accurate quotation from the liſts of public offices.

The Roman Hiſtory, from the foundation of Rome, to the ſubverſion of the Eaſtern Empire, and the taking of Conſtantinople by the Turks, in *A. D.* 1453. *Including the Antiquities, Manners, and Cuſtoms, as well as the Juriſprudence and Military Eſtabliſhment of the Romans. In Seven Books.* By the Rev. J. Adams, A. M. Author of the Hiſtory of Great Britain, &c. 1 Vol. 12mo. Pp. 372, 4s. 6d. bound. Law. 1805.

THE noble ſubject of this volume has been ſo often and ſo ably diſcuſſed, that any farther attempt could not be expected to have much claim to novelty. In the preſent, we, however, find that the matter of the three laſt books is new, conſidering it in the light of an abridgment. Theſe books compriſe the hiſtory of the Roman Empire in the Eaſt, after its fall in the Weſt; the taking of Conſtantinople by the Turks, the manners, cuſtoms, laws, and military eſtabliſhments of the Romans, and much miſcellaneous information reſpecting Roman affairs. The laſt book, in particular, by containing a vaſt fund of curious information, anecdotes and ſketches, unconnected with the regular hiſtory, renders the volume extremely uſeful, as a ſchool book.

"We ſhall take a chapter from the ſeventh book, to ſhew the nature of the information it contains, and the manner in which the author has executed his taſk.

"The narrow policy of preſerving without any foreign mixture, the pure blood of the ancient citizens, had checked the fortune, and haſtened the ruin, of Athens and Sparta. The aſpiring genius of Rome ſacrificed vanity and merit whereſoever they were to be found, whether among ſlaves or ſtrangers, enemies or barbarians. During the moſt flouriſhing æra of the Athenian commonwealth, the number of citizens gradually decreaſed from thirty to twenty-one thouſand.

"On the contrary, the Roman citizens, who, in the firſt cenſus of Servius Tullius,

Tullius, amounted to no more than eighty three thouſand men, able to bear arms in the ſervice of their country, when the allies of Rome claimed an equal ſhare of honours and privileges, the ſenate preferred the chance of arms to an ignominious conceſſion. The Samnites and the Lucanians paid the ſevere penalty of their raſhneſs; but the reſt of the Italian ſtates, as they ſucceſſively returned to their duty, were admitted into the boſom of the republic, and ſoon contributed to the ruin of freedom.

"Under a democratical government, the citizens exerciſe the power of ſovereignty. But when the popular aſſemblies were ſuppreſſed by the adminiſtration of the emperors, the conquering nations were diſtinguiſhed from the vanquiſhed, only as the firſt and moſt honourable order of ſubjects; and their increaſe however rapid, was no longer expoſed to the ſame dangers, yet the princes who adopted the maxims of Auguſtus, guarded with the ſtricteſt care the dignity of the Roman name, and diffuſed the freedom of the city with a prudent liberality. Till the privileges of Romans had been progreſſively extended to all the inhabitants of the empire, an important diſtinction was preſerved between Italy and the provinces. The former was eſteemed the center of public unity, and the firm baſis of the conſtitution.

"Italy claimed the birth or at leaſt the reſidence, of the emperors and the ſenate. The eſtates of the Italians were exempt from taxes, their perſons from the arbitrary juriſdiction of governors. Their municipal corporations, formed after the perfect model of the capital, were entruſted with the execution of the laws. From the foot of the Alps to the extremity of Calabria, all the natives of Italy were born citizens of Rome. Their partial diſtinctions were obliterated, and they inſenſibly became one great nation united by language, manner, and civil conſtitutions, and equal to the weight of a powerful empire.

"The republic gloried in her generous policy, and was frequently rewarded by the merit and ſervices of her adopted ſons. Had ſhe always confined the direction of the Romans to the ancient families within the walls of the city, that immortal empire would have been deprived of ſome of its nobleſt ornaments.

"Virgil was a native of Mantua; Horace was inclined to doubt whether he ſhould call himſelf an Apulian or a Lucanian; it was in Padua that an hiſtorian was found worthy to record the majeſtic ſeries of Roman victories.

"The patriot family of Cato emerged from Tuſculum; and the little town of Arpinum claimed the double honour of producing Marius and Cicero, the former of whom deſerved, after Romulus and Camillus, to be ſtyled the third founder of Rome; and the latter, after ſaving his country from the deſigns of Catiline, enabled her to contend with Athens for the palm of eloquence. The provinces were deſtitute of any public force, or conſtitutionable freedom.

"In Etruria, Greece, and Gaul, it was the firſt care of the ſenate to diſſolve thoſe dangerous confederacies, which taught mankind that as the Romans prevailed by diviſion, they might be reſiſted by union. Thoſe princes, whom the oſtentation of gratitude or generoſity permitted for a while to hold a precarious ſceptre, were diſmiſſed from their thrones, as ſoon as they had faſhioned to the yoke the vanquiſhed nations. The free ſtates and cities which had embraced the cauſe of Rome, were rewarded with a nominal alliance, and inſenſibly ſunk into a real ſervitude. The public authority

authority was every where exercised by the ministers of the senate, and of the emperors; and that authority was absolute and without controul.

"Whereſoever the Roman conquers, he inhabits," is a very just observation of Seneca, confirmed by history and experience. The natives of Italy, allured by pleasure or interest, hastened to enjoy the advantages of victory; and we may remark, that about forty years after the reduction of Asia, eighty thousand Romans were massacred in one day, by the cruel orders of Mithridates.

"These voluntary exiles were engaged, for the most part, in the occupations of commerce and agriculture; for after the legions were rendered permanent by the emperors, the provinces were peopled by a race of soldiers; and the veterans, whether they received the reward of their service, in land or money, usually settled with their families in the country, where they had honourably spent their youth. Throughout the empire, but more particularly in the western parts, the most fertile districts, and the most convenient situations, were served for the establishment of colonies; some of which were of a civil, and others of a military nature. In their manners and internal policy, the colonies formed a perfect representation of their great parent; and, as they were soon endeared to the natives by the ties of friendship and alliance, they effectually diffused a reverence for the Roman name, and a desire which was seldom disappointed, of sharing in due time its honours and advantages.* The municipal cities insensibly equalled the rank and splendor of the colonies; and in the reign of Adrian it was disputed which was the preferable condition; those societies which had issued from, or those which had been received into, the bosom of Rome.

"Each chapter concludes with biogrophical accounts of the distinguished persons who figured during the period which it comprises; and the compilation is altogether made with considerable ability.

MEDICINE, SURGERY, &c.

The Domestic Medical Guide, in two Parts.—Part I. *the Family Dispensary: or a Complete Companion to the Family Medicine Chest, &c. Part* II. *the Modern Domestic Medicine; comprehending the most Approved Methods of treating and obviating the different Diseases that assail the Human Frame; with the most important Information relative to the Cure of those chronic Diseases which have been generally considered incurable. Third Edition, considerably enlarged and corrected.* By Richard Reece, M. D. Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, London, Author of the Medical and Chirurgical Pharmacopeia, &c. &c. Pp. 500. Longman and Co. 1805.

THE present edition of this very useful work is dedicated to the venerable Bishop of Llandaff, in consequence of the high terms in which his Lordship had recommended it when it first appeared before the public; since which period a variety of important additions have been made in it. Amongst others we find a chapter, in which the mineral, vegetable, and

* "Twenty-five colonies were settled in Spain, and nine in Britain, of which London, Colchester, Lincoln, Chester, Gloucester, and Bath, still remain."

animal poiſons are briefly conſidered, with their reſpective antidotes. Where arſenic has been taken, our author ſeems to have adopted the treatment recommended by Dr. H. Hahnemann, in his treatiſe on arsenical poiſons, *but has omitted one circumſtance*; the latter adviſes, when immediate recourſe cannot be had to liver of ſulphur, (as in moſt country places muſt be the caſe) to adminiſter a ſtrong ſolution of ſoap in ſimple water to the patient, with a view, partly of neutralizing that corroſive mineral, and partly of exciting *vomitus*—Among the means pointed out for the purpoſe of counteracting the effects of narcotic poiſons, our author ſlightly mentions coffee as a diluter; we can, however, from experience aſſert, that a *ſtrong* infuſion of coffee is one of the moſt efficacious remedies that can be employed for the reſtoration of the ſenſibility, and the removal of the ſpaſm induced by narcotics.—We concur with him alſo in condemning the practiſe of bleeding, if opium be taken, as it naturally muſt lead to accelerate its fatal effects.

Another uſeful addition to this work, is a ſhort treatiſe on ſuſpended animation; when our author noticed ſuffocation by *noxious* vapours, we wiſh, that by way of illuſtration, he had given rather a more detailed explanation, for many will ſtill want information as to the full extent and purport of the term.

We now come to that part of the work which treats of the diſeaſes of children, and have to expreſs our regret, that we cannot well make any extract from it; we, however, recommend it to the ſerious peruſal of all parents and others, who may be intruſted with the management of children in the firſt ſtages of life.

The diſeaſes themſelves are alphabetically arranged; an order, which, though liable to ſome objections, ſtill has its conveniences in a treatiſe of phyſic for the non-medical world.

To the article "Bilious Affections," our author has added ſome very judicious ſtrictures on the numerous noſtrums, ſuggeſted by quacks, which they too ſucceſsfully impoſe on the credulous public, and, as he juſtly obſerves, "too often to the irreparable injury of thoſe, who are induced to take their antibilious traſh." After preſenting a conciſe and accurate deſcription of the manner in which the bile is ſecreted, and may become a *materia peccant* and pointing out appropriate treatment, of which we cannot but approve, he proceeds to expoſe in a proper light, the "miſchiefs done by illiterate empirics with their antibilious medicines," he is very ſevere upon a certain clerical adventurer, who has aſſerted the bile to be "the fruitful parent of the complicated bodily miſeries to which human nature is heir, (ſuch as gout, rheumatiſm, nervous affections, &c. &c.) that we bring it into the world with us; that the *firſt pang* the infant ſuffers, proceeds from it! and that it *haunts* us more or leſs during our continuance in it." We will venture to aſſert, that a more abſurd doctrine, blended with impiety, could ſcarcely be uttered; nor could the reverend empiric have given a greater proof of his total ignorance of anatomy and phyſic, than in the paſſage juſt quoted. Dr. R. adds, that, "the only diſeaſe, that is produced by a vitiated ſecretion of the bile is the cholera morbus, which conſiſts in a copious (*redundant*) evacuation of bile, both by ſtool and vomiting. In ſuch caſes, I have no heſitation in aſſerting, that one doſe of the Rev. William Barclay's *patent* Antibilious Pills would endanger, if not deſtroy the life, of the patient, by producing inflammation of the bowels." Our author then proceeds to make many praiſeworthy ſtrictures on this noſtrum;

noſtrum; to which we ſhall refer ſuch of our readers, as are accuſtomed to be their own phyſicians, and to tamper with their conſtitutions.

Under the head "Cancer" Dr. Reece has laudably introduced the uſe of common diſtilled water, as recommended by Dr. Lamb in chronic diſeaſes. We conſider it ſufficiently important to be here quoted in his own words.

"Dr. Lamb, a phyſician of great celebrity, in his minute examination into the properties, &c. of common water, detected, not only a portion of lead, (from the uſe of leaden ciſterns, pumps, and pipes) but alſo a mineral ſalt, which he aſſerts to be ſo extremely prejudicial to the human frame, as to be the cauſe of thoſe chronic diſeaſes, which ſo often baffle the medical art. From this conviction, the learned doctor confined his patients, afflicted with ſuch diſeaſes, to the uſe of water, diveſted of theſe obnoxious combinations by the proceſs of diſtillation; and it appears, that in ſeveral inſtances, ſome of which are cancerous, his apprehenſions (expectations) have been happily confined. I have had an opportunity of witneſſing the ſalutary effects of his treatment in two very obſtinate caſes with the doctor, and have ſince much employed it with the moſt flattering ſucceſs, which I ſhall notice under the heads of the different diſeaſes (theſe we find to be conſumption of the lungs, diabetes, epilepſy, gout, gravel and ſtone, rickets, &c.) in the cure of which it is likely to prove ſerviceable. I have now two caſes of cancer under my care in which it has proved highly beneficial, and from the great progreſs they have made, I have no doubt but they will in a ſhort time be perfectly cured. (Where they *actually* cancers in theſe two inſtances?) It may appear extraordinary, that an article ſo perfectly innocent, ſhould be capable of curing the moſt formidable diſeaſe that aſſails human nature; but ſimple as it may on firſt view appear, I am perſuaded, that it is a more powerful alterative, than any article in the materia medica, that is capable of producing a greater alteration in the ſyſtem from a ſtate of diſeaſe to health, than any medicine we are acquainted with. In cancerous complaints, the uſe of diſtilled water changes the blackiſh appearance and fœtor of the ſtools, which the ancient phyſicians conſidered to be the cauſe of the diſeaſe. It likewiſe alters the peculiar countenance of cancerous patients, prevents the dark incruſtation of the teeth, and deſtroys the fœtor of the breath, which were noticed by Hippocrates, Aretæus, and others, as proofs of the vitiated ſtate of the juices in cancerous complaints. This pure water evidently promotes digeſtion, and prevents the acid corruption of the food in the ſtomach and bowels, and thus produces that ſalubrious alteration in the chyle, that the ſtate of the conſtitution, in the courſe of a little time, ſeems to be changed; which, from the mutation the body is continually undergoing, there can be no doubt, but by deviation from the uſe of an accuſtomed bad aliment, a revolution may be accompliſhed, and the cancerous contamination of the ſyſtem be ſo counteracted, as to render the diſeaſe local, and in time to deſtroy it entirely. But to produce this ſalubrious change in the conſtitution, the diſtilled water, or the Malvern water, Worceſterſhire) which is exactly the ſame, ſhould be employed in *every article of diet*, as tea, broth, puddings, &c. &c. and to conſtitute the principal beverage of the patient, or if malt liquor ſhould be preferred, it ſhould be made with it. Genuine claret, perry, or cyder, may be taken in moderate quanties, but port wine and ſpirits are highly injurious. The

diet ſhould principally conſiſt of milk, vegetables, and a ſmall propor tion of animal food."

Our author continues:

"Experience has ſufficiently proved that chronic diſeaſes will not readil yield even to active remedies; ſo by this mode of treatment no advantage wi appear, till this change of conſtitution is effected, which will ſometime require a period of three or four months; but as the plan is ſimple, an does not exclude the employment of any conſtitutional, or topical remedie that may be ſuggeſted by men of judgment, it cannot be objected to o that account; in caſes of ſuch a nature it is fortunate to obtain a cure" (w may venture to ſay, even *relief*) at any rate." It is indeed our moſt ſincer wiſh, that Dr. R. may meet with that ſucceſs in the treatment of a dread ful diſorder, of which he entertains ſo ſanguine an opinion.

Under the head "conſumption of the lungs" we felt pleaſed with th remarks of our author on the impropriety and danger of uſing certai pretended balſams and ſyrups advertiſed as ſafe and infallible. His ſtric tures upon Regnault's "Obſervations, &c." we entirely coincide with on the whole, we are convinced, that he has made every attempt, t preſent his readers with a diſtinct idea of that fatal diſeaſe under i various points of view, but ſtill we muſt remark, that the caſes ſelecte for the purpoſe of illuſtrating his treatment of conſumption, rather borde on pompoſity, and approach to that ſyſtem of puffing, which he ſo conſtantl condemns.

The *Materia Medica* of this book is clear, comprehenſive, and calculate to anſwer all the purpoſes of domeſtic reference: while the work, as a whole, is unexceptionable, and in our opinion muſt prove more uſeful t families than certain ſimilar publications of notoriety, which rather excit than check a ſpirit of private empiriciſm.—We muſt, however, expre our wiſh that the author had omitted entirely the treatiſe on a particula diſeaſe, which we can by no means conſider as an *improvement* to this edition —The article on ſcurvy is, in our opinion, too trite for the importance o the ſubject. There certainly is a ſevere ſcorbutic diſeaſe prevalent in thi country, which is very different from cutaneous eruptions, or from th ſcurvy of ſeamen.

Outlines of a Plan calculated to put a Stop to the Progreſs of the Malignant Conta gion, which rages on the Shores of the Mediterranean, if, notwithſtanding ever Precaution to the Contrary, it ſhould unfortunately make its way into this Country. By Richard Pearſon, M. D.

THE active mind of Dr. Pearſon, inceſſantly directed to objects o public utility, has here embraced a ſubject of great importance. Think ing that there is much danger of the plague being imported into thi country from the ſhores of the Mediterranean, he propoſes the adoption o ſome judicious meaſures for counteracting its baleful effects, in addition t the ordinary precaution of quarantine. The principal of theſe is the eſtabliſh ment of *Committees of Health* in the different ſea-ports, the ſuggeſtions are certainly deſerving the ſerious attention of Government, and do credi to the Doctor's vigilance and zeal.

DIVINITY.

DIVINITY.

Britain's Confidence in perilous Times. A Sermon preached at Haddington, December 9, 1804, to the Regiment of the Eaſtern Mid-Lothian Volunteers. By the Rev. William Bennet, Miniſter of Duddington, as their Chaplain. 8vo. Pp. 52. Manners and Miller, and Conſtable and Co. Edinburgh. 1805.

THIS Sermon, from 2 Chron. xxxii. 7, 8, was very warmly recommended to our notice, as ſuperior to the greater number of thoſe which have been given to the public as delivered on ſimilar occaſions. We accordingly, ſat down to the peruſal of it with the hope of finding in it a rich and elegant entertainment. But whether our hopes had been raiſed too high, or whether our taſte be indeed leſs refined than that of the friend to whoſe praiſe we are indebted for our knowledge of it, certain it is that our expectations have been greatly diſappointed, and that, inſtead of a very delicate feaſt, we have found only common and homely fare. The author appears to be a very good man, of ſound religious and political principles, a lover of his country, devoted to his God, and loyal to his king. The diſcourſe, however, in our opinion diſplays no great ſtrength of intellectual powers, but little depth or even accuracy of thought, and no eminent ſkill in the art of writing. On the contrary, his conceptions are often confuſed, and ſometimes inconſiſtent. His language, though laboured, is frequently incorrect; and his very attempts at ornamented compoſition diſcover either great deficiency of judgment, or great want of practice. His ſentiments are always good, but they are not always well expreſſed. The juſtneſs of theſe ſtrictures muſt be ſubſtantiated by extracts. In his introductory paragraph the author writes thus:

"Diſcourſes from the pulpit upon ſubjects of politics, or of war, *have, of late, been too frequent in our land, and have often incurred cenſure.* When they are ſwelled with unſeaſonable ſpeculation, affected philoſophy, or virulent abuſe, they are utterly unfit for ſcenes of religious worſhip, and in their tendency and temper, obviouſly unchriſtian. But to mark the counſels of the providence of God to nations, or to individuals; *to enforce the duties peculiar to a ſtate of war, or of public calamity*; to arouſe to reformation and penitence, to faith and fortitude, to renewed zeal and confidence in God, *can at no time be deemed unbecoming in the miniſters of religion.* In the preſent circumſtances in which we are aſſembled in this place, it might even be thought injudicious or negligent, if ſuch an opportunity ſhould be omitted, of directing your ſerious attention to duties, which, *on other occaſions, may ſeem to avoid our notice, or to ſtretch beyond our ſphere.* Invited as I am, to officiate for a time, as Chaplain to a band of my countrymen generouſly aſſembled in arms for the defence of their country, in perilous times, I ſhall not ſcruple to direct your attention, with affection and ſerioufneſs, to the topics moſt intereſting in our preſent condition." (Pp. 8, 9.)

To us, we muſt confeſs, this paſſage exhibits an inclination to join in that abſurd and ſenſeleſs cant of declamation which, in the mouths of deſigning or ignorant men, is ſo often directed againſt political ſermons, of which declamation the object is to debar the clergy from meddling with ſecular affairs in the pulpit, and, of courſe, from enforcing the duty of obedience to lawful authority. Why elſe the obſervation, that ſuch ſer-

mons "*have, of late been too frequent in our land, and have often incurred cenſure?*" The author, indeed, ſeems to confine his cenſure to ſuch ſermons as are "ſwelled with unſeaſonable ſpeculation, affected philoſophy, and virulent abuſe," which, he rightly obſerves, "are utterly unfit for ſcenes of religious worſhip." But Mr. B. might have recollected that diſcourſes ſwelled with ſuch ingredients are utterly unfit for any ſcenes; and that, beſides, ſuch ingredients have no neceſſary connection with political ſermons. Accordingly, with no ſmall degree of that inconſiſtency which we have noticed above, Mr. B. publiſhes a political ſermon; and, what is ſtill more ſingular, he lays it down, *as a general maxim*, that "*to enforce the duties peculiar to a ſtate of war, or of public calamity, can* AT NO TIME *be deemed unbecoming in the Miniſters of religion.*" Our readers will obſerve that Mr. B. has here (unwarily, indeed, and unwittingly, we ſuppoſe,) extended, inſtead of curtailing, the privileges of the clergy. The greateſt politicians among them, we believe, have been accuſtomed to confine their diſcourſes on political ſubjects to times in which they thought that ſuch diſcourſes were particularly called for. But Mr. B. has given them an unlimited licence to preach *political*, or, at leaſt, *war-ſermons*, at all times, without exception or diſtinction.

Our next quotation ſhall be a pretty long one, which will enable our readers to form ſome judgement of this author's talent for correct compoſition.

"This monarch [Hezekiah] *was* both religious and brave. He *had been* bleſſed in his endeavours to reſtore the drooping ſtate of Judah, and to promote a happy reformation of national manners. Amidſt his ardent labours to re-eſtabliſh wiſe laws, pure religion, and *juſt* morals [the epithet is a bad one] in the land, the country *is threatened* with a vaſt and overwhelming calamity, which it *ſeemed* almoſt vain and hopeleſs to reſiſt. Sennacherib, king of Aſſyria, the moſt warlike prince, and ſovereign of the moſt powerful monarchy of that age, *threatens* to invade and enſlave the nation. He *had* already *ſubdued*, or *overawed*, all the countries around. He *had* uniformly *been* victorious in arms, and with his proſperity, his arrogance *had become* boundleſs. He *ſends* the moſt inſolent meſſages to the king of Judah, *threatens* the moſt mercileſs violence, and *prepares* barbarous hoſts of hitherto unſubdued troops to ravage and enſlave the land. What *could* Hezekiah oppoſe to ſuch a torrent of deſtructive fury? What *could* ſo ſmall a nation effect againſt ſuch armed and barbarous hordes? The pious king *ſeeks* refuge in his God. He *calls* the people to repentance and to prayers; while he *employs*, at the ſame time, the moſt prudent and the moſt vigorous meaſures of defence. He *proclaims* ſolemn faſts, *entreats* the interceſſions of devout ſaints, and particularly of the prophet Iſaiah, who *lived* at *that period*, and *is* himſelf zealous and ardent in prayer."

"But he *neglects* not, at the ſame time, the exertions of activity and prudence which *became* his ſituation. He *deliberates* with his counſellors and generals, 'his princes and mighty men,' on the beſt means of defence. By their advice he *reſolves* to remove all proviſions out of the reach of the enemy; to conceal or deſtroy the fountains of water, which, in a hot climate are few, but *indiſpenſibly neceſſary to the very exiſtence of an army.*" [This, ſurely, is a moſt important piece of information.] "He *chooſes* favourable military ſtations, *builds* forts, *prepares* weapons for the people, *pikes* [the text ſays *darts*], ſwords, and arrows in abundance. He *appoints* men of experience and honour to train the people to the uſe of arms. Theſe 'captains of war,'

war,' as they are entitled in the preceding verſe, he *ſelects* to eſtabliſh military diſcipline, in a voluntary and united army of his ſubjects. With undaunted ardour, he *labours* to elevate their minds above *baſe fear* or *cowardly diſmay*, and to arouſe them to courage and to confidence. With unſhaken faith in his God he *animates* them to truſt in his protection, and even *ventures* to aſſure them, through his favour, of triumph and ſucceſs." (Pp. 11—13.)

That this paſſage is elaborate is inſtantly perceived; and that the author regarded it as a happy effuſion it is reaſonable to believe. But it has not, we think, any title to be conſidered as ſuch. Independently of other blemiſhes, both in thought and in ſtyle, it is pervaded by one groſs and capital defect, for which, if Mr. B. had been delivering a declamation in any college in either of our Univerſities, he would have been ſeverely reprimanded by his tutor. Mr. B. has evidently heard of the principle, laid down by the rhetoricians, that a narration of paſt events is enlivened by repreſenting them as preſent, and paſſing in review before the hearer or reader. Theſe gentlemen, accordingly, recommend it to writers to relate *paſt events* in the *preſent tenſe*. Mr. Bennet was reſolved to give force to his matter, and brilliancy to his manner, by following their advice. But he unfortunately forgot that it is no part of their rule to exhibit the ſame ſeries of events *partly as paſt and partly as preſent*. Yet this he has done in ſo awkward a way that his narrative is one continued jumble of the moſt diſcordant inconſiſtency. He has been unable to view his ſubject ſteadily. The paragraph immediately following that which is laſt quoted commences thus: "The iſſue of the conteſt is well known." The *conteſt* is here moſt evidently ſuppoſed to be paſt, yet the author, in the very next words, deſcribes its progreſs and termination in the ſtyle of the preſent. "When the Aſſyrian army *enters* the country, &c." This is bad enough; but we have ſtill a more material objection to the author's language here. *There was, in fact, no conteſt.* "Thus ſaith the Lord concerning the king of Aſſyria, *he ſhall not come into this city, nor ſhoot an arrow there, nor come before it with a ſhield, nor caſt a bank againſt it.*" (2 Kings xix. 32.) "And the Lord ſent an angel, which cut off all the mighty men of valour, and the leaders and captains in the camp of the king of Aſſyria; ſo he returned with ſhame of face to his own land." (2 Chron. xxxii. 21.) Accordingly our author himſelf afterwards informs us that "they [the Aſſyrian army] are ſmitten by the angel of God, and die in thouſands *without ſtriking a blow.*" (P. 14.)

"It is not," ſays this preacher, "conqueſt or ſlavery that Britons, when united and in arms, can ever dread. *It is not cowardly fear or diſmay that could thus ever impel them to yield up their privileges to a mercileſs deſpot.*" This, we hope, is as true as the author's aſſertion of it is general and peremptory. Yet, a few lines before, he with no great conſiſtency, *ſuppoſes it may be falſe.* "If God," he ſays, "permit not our preparations to be blaſted by a ſpirit of diſunion, *cowardice*, or treachery, theſe threatenings of invaſion *might* [may] be deemed as impotent mockery." (P. 16.) The Corſican Emperor of the French we have juſt heard him deſignating, with great propriety, *a mercileſs deſpot*; and his ſubjects he ſtyles, with equal propriety, *furious* and *rancorous*. We were, therefore, not a little ſurpriſed by the following ſentence, which is meant, we ſuppoſe, as a proof of Chriſtian charity, but which is, certainly, neither judicious nor pertinent. "Of theſe miſguided foes we may pity the deluſions, and pray for the reformation, *inſtead of idly declaiming againſt their perverted character or hoſtile deſigns.*" Yet, to crown the

whole, the next ſentence runs thus: "From their *vain threats* and *hideous crimes*, we now turn more profitably our attention to ourſelves."

Mr. B. enumerates, as "the chief reſources to be employed in a ſtate of war, 1. Genuine courage: 2. Enlightened patriotiſm: and 3. Well-founded confidence in God." (P. 17.) On each of theſe he enlarges, in order, through the remainder of the diſcourſe. With regard to the firſt, the following obſervations, though ſtrictly true, are couched in language which is ſtrikingly ungrammatical. "Religion! may the giddy and unthinking exclaim: And what HAS *wiſdom and religion* to do with bravery? More than can be thought, it may be replied, more than can be expreſſed in language. *It* [i. e. *wiſdom and religion*, clearly] is the only foundation on which courage can be ſafely built, the only rock on which fortitude can reſt unmoved." A little after we are told that "*wicked or impenitent men muſt ever be cowards.*" (P. 18.) That ſuch men have good reaſon to be cowards we ſhall not deny; but that they always are ſo is notoriouſly falſe. Accordingly Mr. B. preſently allows them courage, and aſſigns, (though he rightly cenſures,) the principles from which ſuch courage is derived. Thus, for inſtance, "in ſome men it is the ſavage ebullition of a natural violence of temper, or a brutal fury of character. In others it is a wild ambition, which impels them to ruſh into dangers without either vigour or compoſure of mind, to endure or ſurmount them." The ideas here do not hang very well together; and the next ſentence is again moſt groſsly ungrammatical. *Mere ſhame* in ſome, *and the terror* of diſgrace in a world of folly, *drives* [drive, unqueſtionably] them at times to aſſume an affectation of bravery, which but ill conceals *their alarms within*, and *the native cowardice of their hearts.*" (P. 19.) Our author has, indeed, a ſingular propenſity to join a plural nominative with a ſingular verb. "*Courage* in perſonal dangers, *and contempt* of ſlaviſh *fear*, *is* but a part of that fortitude which is not only a cardinal virtue to the Chriſtian; *but* the guard and ſtrength of all others." The next ſentence is likewiſe faulty. "*It* is that principle of a renewed mind which gives vigour to every other grace, and animates to perſeverance in every other duty." Here, by the conſtruction, the pronoun *it* ſeems naturally to refer to *courage*. It is meant, however, to refer to *fortitude*; and our author accordingly thus addreſſes his hearers: "Labour and pray to poſſeſs this ineſtimable fortitude, that greater honours than thoſe of victory in war may be ſecured to you." (P. 25.)

The ſecond head of Mr. B.'s diſcourſe is handled with more ſucceſs than the firſt. He very properly rejects the idea that patriotiſm, or the love of our country, is a contracted principle, and diſcouraged by the goſpel. Having quoted Pſ. cxxxvii. 5, he thus proceeds:

"To whom does this language not appear to be natural and juſt? What mind is ſo rude or contracted, as not to enter into theſe ſentiments? In what regions of the earth, among what tribes is the ſecret charm not felt which chains the hearts of men to their native land? Not only was the Iſraelite thus bound to his favoured country, the Greek and the Roman to their genial climes, but the Scythian to his barren plains; the Swiſs to his rocky mountains; the Swede to his ſnowy wilds; the Scot to his bleak hills; nay even the Arab to his blaſted deſert, and the Greenlander to his icy rocks." (p. 28.) The author ſhould have adverted that though the paſt time *was* ſuits the four firſt nations here mentioned, it can, with no propriety, be applied to the five laſt, which ought evidently to have been ſpoken of in the preſent. He goes on to ſay, "With us patriotiſm is not an

an impulſe of feeling alone. It is a law of deliberate reaſon. It is a dictate of gratitude to God for the enjoyment of our peculiar privileges. It is a branch almoſt of our religion itſelf, *as in our country alone we can enjoy its bleſſings in all their purity.*" (p. 29.) This laſt aſſertion is too unlimited, and not ſtrictly true. But the following obſervations are natural, and happily expreſſed. "From a blended union of intereſting recollections a glow of affection ariſes in almoſt every breaſt, at the thought even of the inſenſible monuments of their land. Its mountains, woods, and ſtreams, mute to others, are not without expreſſion to them. The place of their birth, the memory of earlieſt friendſhips, the companions of the years of youth, the ſchool in which they have been educated, the church to which they have ſo often walked, and taken ſweet counſel with their friends, the graves which cover the bones of their fathers, all ſpeak a language intelligible and perſuaſive to their hearts." (Ibid.)

We cannot, however, ſpeak of the paſſage which we are going to ſubjoin in ſuch favourable terms. "If we turn to our civil inſtitutions, how diſtinguiſhed are the advantages of poſſeſſing equitable laws, a free conſtitution, *a pious ſovereign*, the equal adminiſtration of juſtice, equal rights to protection and ſecurity in every rank, nay equal acceſs to the higheſt honours or emoluments of the land, to merit even in the loweſt ſtations." (p. 30.) That, at preſent, we poſſeſs *a pious ſovereign* will be moſt readily allowed; and long may he continue to ſet an example to his people! But, as the author ſtates it, this would ſeem to be one of the natural advantages of our civil inſtitutions, as much ſo as *equitable laws*, &c. Moſt heartily do we wiſh that it were the caſe; but, unfortunately, neither theory nor experience will authorize us to believe ſo. The following paſſage exhibits ſuch a jumble of unconnected ideas as we have ſeldom ſeen. We have tried (but all our attempts have been in vain), to ſeparate and reduce them to order. "Even in circumſtances which are merely natural and local, how highly favoured is our native iſle! By the friendly influence of the ocean and the elements, under the appointment of a kind Providence, how happily has it been preſerved peaceful, healthy, and ſecure, amidſt the ſtorms of diſtant war, amidſt the rumours and horrours re-echoed from every ſide, of the ravages of anarchy, peſtilence, or the ſword?" Pp. 30, 31.)

This author is, throughout his whole diſcourſe, very laviſh of the rhetorical figure called Interrogation. But, under his third diviſion, he riſes to yet higher flights of oratory, and dazzles us with the ſublimer embelliſhments of Apoſtrophe and Perſonification. Though we have, already, almoſt exceeded our limits, we muſt ſtill preſent our readers with a ſpecimen.

"Britain! thou ruleſt the ocean; thou reigneſt as Queen of the Iſles. Thou *covereſt the ſeas with thy ſhips, and the lands with thy commerce.*" [The antitheſis, we think, is not very happy.] "Thou haſt aſtoniſhed the ends of the earth with thy fame and thy power. Bow before thy God. Tremble even at the dazzling view of thy towering proſperity. The pollution of luxury aſſails thy children. The canker of corruption preys upon thy vital ſtrength. Thou gazeſt fondly upon the myriads of thy ſons glittering in arms by thy ſide, and ſmileſt, from thy rocks, *with contempt on thy baffled foes.*" [The author is here, we hope, in a miſtake; for this would be a great proof of folly in Britain. Her foes are any thing but *contemptible.*] "Thou delighteſt to number thy fleets, and to marſhal thy *countleſs hoſts.*"

[Reader,

[Reader, this is the figure called Hyperbole.] "Tremble at the thought of thy ſins. If thou *art* [be] doomed to be chaſtiſed; if thou *art* [be] forſaken or renounced, great ſhall be thy fall. Nations, who have delighted in thy name, ſhall mourn in the duſt for thee. Thy fierce foes, with ſavage fury, *would trample upon thy glory departed.*" [That would be ſomething extraordinary indeed.] "They would ſhout, with infernal triumph over thy ruined ſtate, and exult with mercileſs arrogance in thy miſery and diſgrace." (Pp. 41, 42.)

There is yet much more of this impaſſioned eloquence; but we cannot afford room for it. The learned preacher however, in time, deſcends to topics much more practical and uſeful. He directs his diſcourſe immediately to his hearers; and his addreſs is full of excellent and appropriate advice. With the ſubſequent paſſage we were particularly pleaſed.

"Ye are, for the moſt part, my friends, inhabitants of the country, and happily as yet ignorant of the vices of cities and of camps. Oh! retain your bliſsful ignorance, and carry back to your peaceful homes your honeſt manners, and venerable ſimplicity. Bring not from your military purſuits the licentious maxims of corrupted ſoldiers. Can you bear the thought that you ſhould intrude diſorder and diſgrace into your native villages? Shall you baſely labour to corrupt the companions of your youth, to wring the hearts of your mothers with ſhame, or to bend 'the grey hairs of your fathers with ſorrow to the grave!' Better were the day for Britain, frightful as the idea appears, when peſtilence, deſpotiſm, or war, ſhould lay waſte her ſhores, than when plagues, far more pernicious, from the new military occupations of her inhabitants, ſhould infect their manners and poiſon their peace." (Pp. 49, 50.)

To this paſſage is ſubjoined, in the margin, a note, which, in our opinion, is, beyond compariſon, the beſt part of the whole performance. It is extremely well written. The ſubject of it is of high importance, and is treated in a manner at once the moſt ſerious, ſimple, and impreſſive. This note we ſhall lay before our readers, and with it take leave of Mr. Bennet's publication.

"In the preſent war, it is not the dread of foreign foes that need alarm Britain; for with ſuch armies and fleets, almoſt unprecedented in hiſtory, the idea of conqueſt, or even of invaſion, muſt appear to be impracticable, or only to be contemned. It is not even the expences of the preſent immenſe armaments, however enormous, that need excite our chief anxiety; for the reſources of the country are vaſt, and the funds thus raiſed chiefly circulate from the higher through the lower ranks in the preſent ſyſtem of defenſive war. But it may well merit the ſerious attention of the legiſlature to guard in time againſt other dangers far more formidable, which already preſs upon the land from the new military purſuits of the people. The ſimple inhabitants of the country mingle every where with the troops of the line, who are too often compoſed of the moſt idle, diſſipated, and unprincipled inhabitants of the towns. They ſee their licentious pleaſures, and hear their impious converſation. They are tempted to think that their vices are eſſential to ſhew the ſpirit of ſoldiers, and weakly affect to ape their manners. They immediately attempt the practice of theſe fatal leſſons in the villages where they are quartered, or carry them home for future experiments to their original dwellings. Let the candid and reflecting obſerve the ſtate of young women, the manners of young men, and the new aſpect of the people, where ſuch troops have been for ſome time quartered.

quartered. Let the friends of their country weigh the conſequences, and deviſe ſome reſources of wiſdom to prevent the dangers. Let them who have the power, or opportunity, at laſt direct ſome ſerious attention to the ſtate of moral and religious principles in our fleets and armies. Without ſome effectual exertions to avert ſuch ills, the national character may ſoon experience a ruinous change, the vigour of Britain ſink into degeneracy, and proſperity be ſucceeded by diſgrace." (Pp. 50, 51.)

A Sermon preached in St. Andrews's Church, Edinburgh, on Thurſday, March 8, 1804, *before the Directors of the Aſylum for the Blind, and publiſhed at their deſire.* By the Rev. David Ritchie, one of the Miniſters of St. Andrew's Church, Edinburgh. 8vo. Pp. 33. Edinburgh: printed by J. Moir. 1804.

THIS is a Sermon of diſtinguiſhed merit, with which we have great ſatisfaction in making our readers acquainted. It diſplays a mind of ſuperior endowments both natural and acquired; a mind in which ſtrong powers of intellect are happily combined with ſoundneſs of judgment and correctneſs of taſte. It is a maſterly diſcourſe on a very intereſting text (John ix. 1—3), and is written with great ability, as well as with appropriate relation to the occaſion. In point of argument, it is perſuaſive and plain. The advice which it contains is moſt ſalutary and affectionate, while the ſtyle of it is uniformly chaſte and elegant.

The reaſon and meaning of the curious queſtion which was put, by our Lord's diſciples, in the text, are thus ſimply, but ſatisfactorily, explained.

" We find, from this paſſage of Scripture, that the religious opinions of the Jews, at the time of our Saviour's appearance, were, in ſome reſpect, different from thoſe declared by the law and the prophets. 'The traditions of the Elders had perverted both the precepts and the principles delivered by the inſpired writers; and the intercourſe which had long ſubſiſted between Judea and the neighbouring countries, accuſtoming the people to the opinions of the heathen, had introduced among them ſeveral errors which prevailed among the nations around. Hence they had admitted into their religious ſyſtem a doctrine, common in antiquity, that the ſouls of men exiſted before their union with the body; and, that many of the ſufferings of the preſent life might be regarded as the puniſhment of guilt contracted in the pre-exiſtent ſtate. Miſtaking alſo the meaning of a particular part of their law, they held that the ſins of parents might be puniſhed in the perſons of their children: and on theſe principles they accounted for many of the evils that prevail in the world."

" Theſe opinions our Saviour's diſciples, like the great body of their countrymen, had received with implicit belief; and thence they propoſed the queſtion, 'Who did ſin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?' They never doubted that a natural defect, ſo calamitous, muſt have proceeded from the diſpleaſure of God, on account of ſome heinous tranſgreſſion; and they only wiſhed to know whether the ſufferer himſelf, or his parents, had committed the ſin which had met with ſo ſignal a puniſhment." (Pp. 5—7.)

We think, with Mr. R. that our Saviour's anſwer may be ſuppoſed to have had particular " reference to the miracles [which] he was about to perform." " Neither," ſaith he, " hath this man ſinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God ſhould be made manifeſt in him." *The works*

of

of God were, undoubtedly, *made manifeſt*, when he who had been born blind received ſight. But our author conſiders our Lord's reply in a more extended view, as unfolding the great general principle on which all the varieties in the natural endowments of men depend. Theſe varieties are all intended "to manifeſt the works of God," and to diſplay his attributes, whether the endowments themſelves be more ſparingly or more liberally beſtowed. Taking the ſubject in this light, the learned preacher 1. ſhews, generally, that the variety which is found in the natural endowments of individuals is perfectly conſiſtent with the juſtice of God, and manifeſts his wiſdom and goodneſs, as well as his ſovereign power. 2. He "examines more particularly the caſe of the blind, with the deſign of proving that it forms no exception to the general principles of the divine diſpenſations." And, 3. He points out "the improvement of the ſubject." (P. 8.)

Under the firſt head we find much ſolid reaſoning, which is admirably calculated to "vindicate the ways of God to man." Our author obſerves that it appears to be the deſign of the Creator to unite, in his creatures, a general ſimilarity of Nature, with a boundleſs diverſity of peculiar qualities and diſcriminating circumſtances. "Nations differ from one another in a multitude of circumſtances, which no ſkill or power of man can equalize. Individuals come into the world with very unequal powers and capacities. There is no natural advantage which all men enjoy in the ſame degree. Affluence is the inheritance of ſome, and poverty of others. Some poſſeſs all the faculties of mind and body in a high degree of perfection, and ſome in a very imperfect meaſure. To a few, one, or even more, of the capacities moſt generally uſeful are denied: and, if we except the functions which are abſolutely eſſential to life, there is hardly a ſingle power of either mind or body, of which ſome individuals have not been found deſtitute." (Pp. 9, 10.) But this unequal diſtribution, our author argues, is no impeachment of the juſtice of God. On this ſubject the following obſervations, we think, are particularly excellent.

"The Supreme Being can be ſubject to no limitation, in appointing the condition of his creatures, but what ariſes from the perfect uſe of his own attributes. As he is poſſeſſed of unbounded goodneſs, we know that, wherever he confers life, he muſt intend to communicate happineſs. *To bring creatures into exiſtence, for the purpoſe of making them miſerable, would be to act from pure malignity, a principle which cannot dwell in the all-perfect mind.* And, therefore, we may conclude that God has created none of his creatures for this purpoſe; but that life is a bleſſing in whatever circumſtances it is given, and to whatever extent it is conferred."

"But excepting this limitation, we can conceive no other reſtriction on the creating power of God. On no principle of reaſon can it be maintained that he muſt give certain particular capacities, or a ſpecific degree of happineſs, to any one of his creatures. The claims of juſtice, as well as of goodneſs, are ſatisfied, when life is rendered a bleſſing. To what extent this bleſſing ſhould, in any caſe, be given, muſt be left to the determination of him who beſtows it; for on this point we are wholly unqualified to decide. If it be conſiſtent with juſtice in the Creator to make men inferior to angels, it is equally juſt to make one man inferior to another. If they who are moſt highly endowed among men have no reaſon to complain that their endowments are not higher, they to whom the gifts of God have been more ſparingly diſpenſed, have as little right to think that they have received leſs than was due to them." (Pp. 11, 12.)

But

But farther; inequalities in the diſtribution of the gifts of God are, in as many reſpects, beneficial to the world: and this the learned preacher ſhews to be true, whether theſe inequalities regard the conditions of nations or of individuals. Beſides, "defects of any one kind are always, in a certain degree, compenſated by advantages of ſome other nature. "This principle," as our author obſerves, "ſeems, indeed, to be univerſal in the human condition. The want, and the proper means of ſupply; the evil, and its correſponding alleviation, are always found beſide one another. Parental affection is adapted to the helpleſſneſs of childhood. Remedies alleviate or remove diſeaſe. The earth furniſhes the materials for ſupplying our wants; and men are endowed with power and ſkill to accommodate the various productions of nature to their proper uſe. If there are ſufferings, and loſſes, and diſappointments, which cannot be avoided, the mind is capable of fortitude, and reſignation, and hope; by the exerciſe of which the burden may be ſuſtained, which we are not permitted to throw off. And, as we muſt all at length ſubmit to die, religion opens to us the proſpect of a bleſſed immortality, to enable thoſe who act wiſely, to meet death without alarm." (Pp. 16, 17.)

The general principle is moſt happily illuſtrated in our ingenious author's ſtatement of the comparative condition of the rich and poor. The paſſage deſerves the moſt ſerious attention and regard from both. For, undoubtedly, were the learned preacher's reflections always preſent to their minds, the rich would not be, ſo frequently, puffed up with their ſuppoſed advantages, on the one hand, or the poor ſo diſcontented and querulous on account of their ſuppoſed diſadvantages, on the other.

"A ſimilar proviſion may be obſerved for remedying the hardſhips which are thought to ariſe from the unequal diſtribution of the gifts of fortune. By the appointment of the Supreme Ruler, the great body of mankind muſt labour for the ſupport of life, while a few individuals are, by their ſituation, exempted from this neceſſity. And, as the inequality here is obvious, it gives occaſion to many complaints. Yet, ſuch is the conſtitution of both mind and body, that labour is no hardſhip to him who has always been accuſtomed to it; nor is exemption from toil, to thoſe who know not the fatigue of buſineſs, any bleſſing. And, if the poor would judge fairly of their ſituation, they would own that the Univerſal Father hath not doomed them to hardſhip and trouble only; but that, in connecting health and cheerfulneſs with their employments, and giving them, beſides, all the ſatisfactions depending on religion and virtue, he has not, perhaps, done leſs for their comfort than for that of others, whoſe higher ſtation expoſes them to evils of which the poor know nothing." (Pp. 18, 19.)

Under his ſecond diviſion, Mr. R. obſerves that the ſituation of the blind, compared with others, appears extremely helpleſs and deplorable. It has, accordingly, often been the theme of the penſive moraliſt, has excited the commiſeration of the benevolent, and the active charity of the humane. Yet many circumſtances contribute to counterbalance the evils of blindneſs; and many reſources remain to thoſe affected by it, from which relief may be derived. For—

1. "The human mind is naturally fitted to bear evils which cannot be avoided, as well as to ſurmount difficulties which muſt be overcome. When the value of a bleſſing is not previouſly known, the want of it ſeldom occaſions any great uneaſineſs. Hence natural defects are commonly leſs calamitous in reality than in appearance. The ſpring of the mind, too, acquires

acquires ſtrength and elaſticity by its very exertions to remove impediments which lie in its way. The rational powers of the blind are not inferior to thoſe of other men. Accordingly, "many inſtances have occurred where the difficulties ariſing from want of ſight have yielded to the efforts of genius and perſeverance: and the blind have attained a degree of literary eminence, which not only claims our admiration on account of their peculiar ſituation, but which would have done honour to human nature, even in circumſtances the moſt favourable for intellectual improvement." (P. 22.)

2. Deſireable effects of a ſimilar kind are obſervable in other reſpects. In thoſe deprived of ſight, the other ſenſes are generally more perfect than in the reſt of mankind. "This ariſes, probably," as Mr. R. obſerves, "from the accuracy with which they are obliged to attend to their perceptions, and to mark the moſt minute variations in the notices which the ſenſes convey." By this means the blind are enabled to act for themſelves, and to perform many delicate manual operations with aſtoniſhing accuracy and facility. In this, as in ſo many other circumſtances in the human condition, the defect ſuggeſts the remedy: the difficulty creates the power of overcoming it: the faculty is improved by the neceſſity which obliges us to employ it." (P. 23.)

3. "In moral and religious advantages the blind are not inferior to the reſt of mankind. In ſome reſpects," indeed, "their ſituation may be regarded rather as favourable for preſerving 'a conſcience void of offence;' for it removes them from the influence of many temptations to which others are expoſed." (Pp. 23, 24.) Our author farther obſerves that, if we were warranted to draw from external circumſtances, any inference with regard to the favour of God, the blind might think that they had reaſon to hope for a more abundant ſhare of his love; for the ſuffering part of mankind were the objects of our Saviour's peculiar regard; and the promiſes of the goſpel are addreſſed, in an eſpecial manner, to the poor, the afflicted, and the heavy-laden. But, though ſuch an inference would be unjuſtifiable, we are certain that the want of any natural advantage renders no man leſs entitled to the kindneſs of the Univerſal Father, whoſe mercies are over all his works, and without whom not even a ſparrow can fall to the ground.

In his concluding diviſion Mr. R. inculcates, in impreſſive language, profound reverence for the wiſdom of God, and unreſerved confidence in his goodneſs. On the perſons themſelves, on account of whom this diſcourſe was preached, he preſſes the virtues of contentment with their lot, and gratitude for the mercies which they enjoy. "If all men," he tells them, "were born with the ſame, or equally great, defects as that of which you complain, your condition would be incomparably worſe than it is. And, therefore, the gifts of God to others ſhould be a ground of your thankfulneſs; ſince they are an evidence of the kindneſs with which he adapts the relief [which] he hath provided for you, to the inconveniences of your ſituation." (P. 29.) He finiſhes by urging, on his hearers in general, the duty of contributing liberally to the ſupport of an inſtitution which is founded equally in wiſdom and in charity. "The mere giving of alms to the blind," he ſays, affords but a temporary relief. It leaves them under all the diſcouragements of helpleſsneſs and dependence; and it has no tendency to prevent the degrading habits, which a reliance on caſual charity is found, almoſt univerſally, to produce. But it is the great object of *the Society for the relief of the induſtrious blind*, to enable this helpleſs

helpleſs claſs of men to act for themſelves; to inſtruct them in ſome employment, by the exerciſe of which they may gain a comfortable ſubſiſtence; to accuſtom them to habits of induſtry, and virtue, and piety; —thus rendering them ſatisfied in themſelves, and uſeful to the community." (Pp. 32, 33.)

We have performed a very pleaſing duty in laying before our readers this account of a diſcourſe for which the learned and ingenious preacher has our beſt thanks; which we conſider as nearly a finiſhed model of what ſermons delivered on ſuch occaſions ought to be; and which we wiſh that it were in our power to circulate, ſo that it might be generally read, and particularly to every blind perſon in the kingdom. The only blemiſh which we have obſerved in the author's compoſition is an occaſional, though not very frequent, omiſſion of the relative pronoun when governed by the following verb. This awkward ellipſis ſhould, eſpecially in works of a dignified kind, be proſcribed without mercy; and therefore, we were ſorry to ſee it admitted, though only occaſionally, by ſo elegant and maſterly a writer.

The Duty of Prayer for National Defence, illustrated and recommended: a Sermon, delivered in St. Andrew's Church, Glasgow, on Sunday, 7th August. By the Rev. William Ritchie, D. D. 8vo. Pp. 29. W. Reid and Co. Glaſgow. 1803.

THOUGH this gentleman, and the author of the preceding ſermon are both of the ſame name, we know not that there is any relationſhip between them; but certainly, if there be, neither of them is a diſgrace to the other. This diſcourſe is, undoubtedly, highly creditable both to the talents and to the principles of the preacher, who appears to be a man of conſiderable powers, of the ſoundeſt piety, and of the moſt unſhaken loyalty.

His text is Pſ. cxxii. 6, which he thus applies to the ſituation of Chriſtians. "When we adopt the words of the Pſalmiſt, we do not now pray for the protection of Jeruſalem; for that city has long been levelled with the duſt; nor for the preſervation of the ancient diſpenſation of religion; for it hath been ſuperſeded by the bringing in of a better hope. But if we adopt theſe words, with underſtanding, in our worſhip, we pray for the peace and proſperity of what is as ſacred to us, as Jeruſalem was to the Jews; for the protection of all that is venerable and dear to us as men, as citizens, and as Chriſtians; for the maintenance of our laws, [of] our liberties, [of] our pure and holy religion." (P. 6.)

This very juſt explanation of the text is followed by ſome reaſoning which, we think, is rather refined than ſolid. Dr. R.'s object is to prove that we are bound to pray for the peace of the ſtate as well as of the church; and his argument is thus expreſſed: "By Jeruſalem, here in our text, we cannot underſtand the church as unconnected with the ſtate. Can there be a church on earth that does not conſiſt of human beings? Can human creatures exiſt in ſociety without government and laws? Can there be a government without rulers and judges? Can there be an eſtabliſhment without a ſovereign will conferring power on rulers, and conveying authority to judges? How then can a church conſiſt of perſons independent of the laws, and exempted from obedience to government? In the very nature of things it is impoſſible. We cannot even conceive a church without a ſtate, and the experiment did not

not ſucceed when the attempt was made, in a neighbouring country, to have a ſtate without a church. We cannot then pray for the peace of the one without including the proſperity of the other," (Pp. 6, 7.)

It is certain that every church upon earth muſt conſiſt of human beings, and that all human beings muſt, in ſome degree, be under government and laws. In this ſenſe, therefore, it may certainly be ſaid that there cannot be a church without a ſtate. But the church may be, as it actually was for the three firſt centuries, not only unprotected, but perſecuted, by the ſtate: and even where the former is, as with us, cheriſhed by the latter. The conſtitution of the one is altogether different from that of the other, and each is contrived for conveying to its members advantages of a particular kind. The ſpiritual rights, privileges and bleſſings which we enjoy as members of the church are, in their nature, totally independent of thoſe temporal ones which we derive from the ſtate. It is certainly poſſible, therefore, to pray for the preſervation of that conſtitution of things which enſures the former, without praying for that which enſures the latter; and of conſequence, it is poſſible to pray for the peace and proſperity of the church, without praying for thoſe of the ſtate. We are far from contending that ſuch conduct would be right; for it is every man's duty to be a good ſubject. But Dr. R. confounds things perfectly diſtinct when he ſays that "we cannot even conceive a church without a ſtate," if he means by this aſſertion, as he ſeems to mean, that a church cannot exiſt but *in alliance with the state*. In what follows, however, we moſt heartily concur, as it relates to ourſelves, whoſe "religious eſtabliſhment" our author obſerves, "is interwoven with the whole texture of our political conſtitution, and forms a part of the law of the land."

"There can ſcarcely be a proof of groſſer ignorance, or of more perverted zeal, than what is diſcovered by thoſe who, on the one hand profeſs a regard to the church without the ſtate, and, on the other, by thoſe who profeſs a zeal for the ſtate without the church. They are equally foes to the conſtitution of our country. For, while the miſtaken friends of religion neglect or oppoſe the civil power, and the miſtaken friends of government neglect or oppoſe the intereſts of the church, they are combining their ſtrength to undermine the two pillars on which the order of ſociety depends. The palace of the king and the temple of the Lord are built upon the ſame foundation, for mutual ornament and ſtrength. The hand of treaſon that preſumes to violate the one, will ſoon join ſacrilege to treaſon in profane attempts againſt the other. To fear God and [to] honour the king are precepts equally dictated by the inſpired wiſdom of Solomon, and by the apoſtle of him who is the king of kings. If then we enter properly into the meaning of the Pſalmiſt when we adopt his words, we pray for the defence and proſperity of our country—of our eſtabliſhments in church and ſtate." (Pp. 8, 9.)

The learned preacher then proceeds to unfold what is implied in our prayers for the public good. And ſuch prayers, he ſays, muſt, in the firſt place, imply that we *ſincerely deſire it*; for prayer is the expreſſion of deſire. "How ſevere," he obſerves, "is the reproof which this brings againſt thoſe who pretend habitually to pray for the progreſs of truth, for kings and all in authority, while their conduct and converſation, through life, declare that they with not the accompliſhment of that which they profeſs to implore!" (P. 10.) Secondly, to pray, implies the *hope of obtaining* what we pray for. Accordingly, ſays Dr. R. "for things impoſſible to be granted we never preſume to pray." But of a favourable anſwer to our prayers for our country,

try, our expectations, he argues, are neither preſumptuous nor vain." The experience of paſt deliverance from dangers, imminent and great; the workings of gratitude which we feel to the Sovereign Ruler of nations, for the ſignal advantages which we enjoy; the power to repel invaſion, which we poſſeſs and are bound to exert; the deep public voice that reſounds from ſhore to ſhore, each calling upon each to riſe, to gird on his armour, and to prepare for victory or death; theſe all combine to encourage our hearts, to give vigour to our arms, and to inſpire the well-grounded hope that the patriotic ſpirit, which pervades the Britiſh iſles is the ſtirring of the Divinity within us, and a happy preſage that the Lord our God will fight for us and for our people." (Pp. 11, 12.)

This paſſage, we think, is well entitled, whether we regard the ſentiment or expreſſion, to be called a piece of fine compoſition. We ſhall now tranſcribe a pretty long quotation, which will ſhew how far Dr. R. is removed both from the deluſions of wild enthuſiaſm, and from the deſpicable democratical cant that all war, even in ſelf-defence, is unlawful.

"4. Prayer implies, on our part, the calm, firm, determined purpoſe to employ all our talents, and all our powers, for the attainment of the end which we profeſs to deſire. This is the deciſive mark that diſtinguiſhes zeal from pretended principle. Prayer is too often regarded as an apology for indolence, rather than as a ſpur to exertion. On this rock of offence many ſtumble and fall. While we *ſpeak* of deſire, of hope, of truſt, the hypocrite goes far beyond the honeſt man. He heaves the profoundeſt groans. He ſighs heavily, with ſeeming bitterneſs of ſpirit. He lifts up *devoutly* [with *apparent devotion*,] his eyes to heaven, as an appeal *thither* [this word is, here, not well applied] for his ſincerity. But, when we bring principle to the fair, the only trial of its ſincerity; when we require deeds, and not ſighs and groans; then the hypocrite ſhrinks back. He recoils as from a ſerpent. Doubts ariſe. Difficulties ſtart up. There is a lion in the way. And, with a baſeneſs ſcarcely credible, he pleads humanity and religion as an excuſe for cowardice, diſaffection, and treaſon. But, whatever men may think or ſay, the word of God, which is truth, declares that faith without works is dead. So alſo is prayer; for honeſt prayer is an exerciſe of faith. The prayers of the idle for the ſupply of their wants; the prayers of the coward for deliverance from danger; the prayers of the profligate that the kingdom of God may come;—theſe are an abomination to the Lord. He condemns the idle. He deſpiſes the coward. He abhors the profligate. And ſhall *we* dare to pray for peace and proſperity, while we are unwilling to contribute our part for procuring the one, and ſecuring the other? Let us not deceive ourſelves. He who is not willing to ſacrifice his time, his fortune, his life, for his religion and his liberty, is, at once, a traitor to his country, and a rebel to his God. But let it be remembered that prayer is a ſolemn and awful ſervice. Every petition which we preſent before God is, on our part, a moral obligation contracted that we are reſolved to put forth mind, and heart, and ſoul, and ſtrength, for accompliſhing the end which we wiſh to attain."

"When we plead with heaven for ſucceſs to our ſoldiers and ſailors in war, we declare, before the Lord, that we are willing to fill up the poſts of danger which they fill, and to ſhed our blood in maintaining the cauſe which they now maintain. When we earneſtly pray that our country may be preſerved from the invaſion of a rapacious foe, we do not, we dare not, preſume that miracles are to be wrought for ſecuring us from danger. But we

pledge ourſelves to God and man that we are determined, one and all, young and old, to reſiſt unto blood, the enemies who threaten us. Men may flatter themſelves that they are entitled to ſit quietly at home in perilous times, and that a few hypocritical prayers, and ſome languid unavailing wiſhes, are fully ſufficient to make up their portion of patriotiſm. But, in the Divine government, there is no room for equivocation and mental reſervation. In the ſight of God, every wiſh is a deſire that we may be inſtrumental in rendering our wiſhes effectual. He then who vows, and will not pay; he who prays, and will not act; he who, in critical times, looks up to heaven for aid, and thinks not of making vigorous exertions for repelling the danger;—that perſon is mocking God, and invoking upon himſelf damnation." (Pp. 14—17.

Theſe views are as juſt as they are patriotic. The learned preacher concludes by ſtating a few of the moſt cogent motives which ought to impel us thus to pray and thus to act in the preſent ſituation of our country. He argues from the reſpect which we owe to our forefathers, from whom we have received the richeſt patrimony that can be conveyed from one generation of mortals to another. They have tranſmitted to us the BRITISH CONSTITUTION, which Dr. R. thus beautifully and characteriſtically deſcribes. It is "an auguſt and venerable fabric, the ſacred abode of law, of liberty, and of a divine religion; a fabric, not like the political experiments of modern times, the rapid work of a day, of a month, or of a year; but the ſlow production of ages, the mature reſult of wiſdom, of courage, and of patriotiſm; a fabric deeply founded, and reared with ſteady perſevering ſkill, which the lapſe of time has not weakened, but rendered more firm and ſecure: under the protecting ſhade of which we have grown up in plenty and in liberty; under which we ſee the tombs of our fathers remain unpolluted, and under which we hope that our graves ſhall be dug in freedom and in peace. Shall this," he aſks, in language which well becomes, we think, every loyal ſubject of the Britiſh empire, but which, as well as other parts of Dr. R.'s diſcourſe, Mr. Bennet of Duddingſton would call, we ſuppoſe, *idle declamation againſt the perverted character or hoſtile deſigns of our foes*;—"Shall this be by us neglected, deſpiſed, betrayed to an *upſtart tyrant*? Shall the richneſs of our inheritance tempt the rapacious luſt of plunder to ſeize what we, through cowardice, are bullied by an *impious wretch* infamouſly to reſign? Forbid it all that is pious, generous and brave." (P. 19.)

Our author farther enforces his argument from the duty which we owe to ourſelves, but particularly from that which we owe to our children and poſterity. In this part of his diſcourſe he is peculiarly impreſſive. He then draws a ſhort character of the barbarous foe who threatens to invade us, deſcribes the miſeries which he has inflicted, on Holland and other countries by his arms, as well as on Ireland by his influence, and informs us what we have to expect ſhould his menaces be reduced into effect. We muſt cloſe our account of this excellent ſermon with the two following brief extracts.

"The enemy with whom we have to contend is fierce, unmerciful, unrelenting. His avowed deſign is to annihilate our independence as a nation, and ſubject us to a government, the moſt arbitrary and oppreſſive, under which a degraded people ever groaned. He is followed by hordes of men, inſolent as they are mean; who, to ſatiate their poverty and their pride, are ready now to ruſh forth as beaſts of prey, ſpreading devaſtation and wretched-

wretchedneſs over the globe. The truth of this aſſertion hath been written, in characters of blood, *on every people* whom the armies of France have reached." (p. 24.)

"The fate of Holland, the doom of Switzerland, the horrors of Ireland, ſhall all be accumulated on Britain, if our enemies prevail. Our women ſhall be abandoned to their luſts, our men to the ſword, our property to ſatiate deſires greedy as hell. Our fair iſland, now as a garden which the Lord hath bleſſed, ſhall become one frightful ſcene of carnage and of deſolation; and the very name of Britain ſhall henceforth, diſappear from the annals of the world. And ſhall they prevail No?—They ſhall not, they cannot prevail, unleſs we meanly betray our own cauſe, proclaim ourſelves baſe cowards, and reſolve to be *the ſlaves of ſlaves*." (p. 26.)

Chriſt Crucified: a Sermon, preached at Monifieth, at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. By William Johnſtone. Large 8vo. Pp. 16. Dundee, Chalmers, Ray, and Co. 1803.

TO this diſcourſe are prefixed *prolegomena*, of as curious a kind as we have ever ſeen. On the title page we have a quotation from Dr. Viceſimus Knox, which condemns the "preaching of mere morality." On the next page follows a ſort of dedication, or rather inſcription, which is conceived in theſe terms: "To Mr. James Pagan, Dumfries; as a ſmall mark of eſteem, gratitude, and affection, *from the author*." To this are ſubjoined, on the ſame page, two ſcraps from Biſhop Hall and Dr. South. Two pages more are aſſigned to what is denominated a "preface," which, forgetting the high honour that ſeemed to be excluſively conferred on Mr. James Pagan, is, in general terms, addreſſed to the author's "dear and much reſpected friends." By his *friends*, however, it ſoon appears that Mr. J. means, not his *pariſhioners*, but his *relations*, whom he ſeems deſirous to gratify by giving them this ſpecimen of his powers as a preacher. Of this extraordinary preface we ſhall copy ſome parts.

"Though *long* ſeparated from you, *not by time* and chance, but by Divine Providence, which cannot err, I ſtill retain in my diſtant retreat, a ſoft and ſweet recollection of former days, former ſcenes, and former friend hip; and feel a conſtant ardent wiſh for your preſent and future happineſs. As a ſmall mark of regard and eſteem, I preſent you with this diſcourſe, *in which you will eaſily trace my ſtrain and manner of preaching*. The ſu ject is *of all others* the moſt intereſting and affecting. Calvary, though trodden down of the Gentiles, is ſtill holy gr ound. The blood of ſprinkling, after the lapſe of *almoſt* eighteen hundred years, ſtill retains its myſterious efficacy."

"As this humble tribute is *no ſacrifice to vanity*, I offer no apology for preſuming to appear in print, before my relations and friends. You will read this ſermon, I am perſuaded, at my requeſt."

To us the information is certainly new that a man may be *long* ſeparated from his friends, *but not by time*. With regard however, to that metaphyſical thing, whether entity or non-entity, called *time*, Mr. J. ſeems to entertain ſome peculiar notions. He certainly, at leaſt, does not talk of it like the bulk of mankind: for he ſpeaks, in 1803, of the *death* of Chriſt having taken place *almoſt* eighteen hundred years ago. The principle on which the calculation is founded is, ſurely, not very obvious; but we turn to what is of greater conſequence. Our author aſſures his friends that he does not

print *from vanity*. This, we really think, is a lucky circumſtance; for had the caſe been otherwiſe, he muſt have met, we are afraid, with a very ſevere mortification. He tells them, however, that, in this diſcourſe, they will "eaſily trace his ſtrain and manner of preaching." From the tenor of the ſermon, as well as from the motto on the title-page, it is evident that the character which Mr. J. affects is that of a *goſpel preacher*; and that his ſermon is intended, indirectly at leaſt, as a cenſure on thoſe who, in the ſlang of the party, are accuſed of preaching only *legal doctrine*. If ſo, he has ventured into print too ſoon; for he is not yet ſufficiently inſtructed in the myſteries of the profeſſion. To ſpeak in plain terms, he ſeems not fully to underſtand his ſubject, or to have formed in his mind any clear and conſiſtent ſcheme of the goſpel.

His text is 1 Cor. i. 23. "But we preach Chriſt crucified," and the object of the ſermon is to unfold the import of this phraſe. This object, after a very few preliminary obſervations, is ſtated in theſe words: "*we* proceed to ſhew what is implied in preaching Chriſt crucified." There is glaring impropriety, as well as affectation, in a preacher thus ſpeaking of himſelf in the plural number. No other perſon was to ſhew this but Mr. J. He had no partner in the buſineſs; and, therefore, we cannot perceive the ground on which he reſolved to divide it, in appearance, with others. He goes on to tell us, what is certainly true, that "in attempting to explain the great myſtery of redemption, bold and licentious interpreters have differed widely in their views and opinions. Some," he adds, "extolling and extending the merit of the Chriſtian ſacrifice, which is the propitiation for our ſins, *have pleaded for an univerſal redemption, which, however, ſeems to be a forlorn hope.*" (Pp. 6, 7.) From this it would appear that Mr. J. is one of thoſe ſtrenuous Calviniſts who maintain that Chriſt died to redeem only a ſelect number of the human race, and who, of courſe exclude all men from the hope of ſalvation that are not ſo ſelected. We are glad however, afterwards to find that this hope is not altogether ſo forlorn as it ſeemed to be. For our author informs us that "the purpoſe of mercy is firmly eſtabliſhed by a ſolemn covenant, and may be expected [*the purpoſe of mercy may be expected* is rather a ſingular phraſe.] by every believer, with abſolute certainty, *according to the terms of that covenant*, repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt" (p 10). This paſſage, it is true, may ſeem to confine the mercy of God in Chriſt to thoſe, at moſt, who, having been born where the goſpel is known, may be ſuppoſed to believe. But the author, in the laſt paragraph of his diſcourſe, moſt inconſiſtently aboliſhes every diſtinction, and extends the *purpoſe of mercy to all mankind*. "That Jeſus Chriſt came into the world to ſave ſinners is a faithful ſaying: *that his ſalvation is offered freely and indiſcriminately to all men is an incontrovertible doctrine of ſcripture. There is no obſtacle on the part of Chriſt, who is no reſpecter of perſons, to the ſalvation of any ſinner. There is no defect of mercy in his character:* he is indeed the friend of ſinners. *There is no defect of merit in his atonement: he is adequate* [another ſingular phraſe] *to the ſin of the whole world.* THERE IS NO DEFECT OF GRACE IN HIS SCHEME OF REDEMPTION." (P. 16.)

On the ſubjects, therefore, of univerſal and particular redemption it is evident that this author has not yet made up his mind. Nor is it, we think, much eaſier to reconcile his notions with regard to the neceſſity of an atonement in order to procure the remiſſion of ſin, and the ſalvation of men. In one place he writes in the following terms. "God ſo loved the world, as

to

to give his only begotten ſon, that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh but have everlaſting life. But let us take heed, and not err, concerning this fundamental article. THE INTERPOSITION OF CHRIST WAS NOT NECESSARY *to induce and perſuade God to pity and ſpare mankind, when by tranſgreſſion they had incurred his diſpleaſure.*" (p. 8) Than this aſſertion nothing, ſurely, can be perceived more peremptory. Yet the author in another place, no leſs peremptorily aſſerts the very contrary. "*Had not the ſituation of mankind, as miſerable periſhing ſinners, been deplorable, and,* WITHOUT THE INTERPOSITION OF A MEDIATOR, DESPERATE, *the only wiſe God, who cannot err, would not have had recourſe to the ſhedding of the blood of Chriſt.*" (p. 12.) Theſe are myſterious and dark ſpeculations, with which Mr. J. ſeems not qualified to meddle. They are, indeed, not fit to be meddled with by any man; for they are not only uſeleſs, but highly preſumptuous, and extremely dangerous. All that we know, on this ſubject, from ſcripture (from which it alone can be known,) is the ſimple fact that the death of Chriſt is the life of the world. This comfortable aſſurance muſt excite our gratitude and ſtimulate our exertions. But we ſhall never be either the better, or the wiſer, for endeavouring to penetrate into the hidden reaſons of this wonderful ſcheme.

This ſermon exhibits no inſtance of what could be fairly denominated fine compoſition, nor any of thoſe bold flights of natural oratory which frequently occur in public tions entitled, on the whole, to be conſidered as the production of genius, though untutored and unchaſtized by art. And, therefore, as our readers may, perhaps, expect a ſpecimen of the author's manner, we ſhall copy his introductory paragraph, which, we think, is equal to any part of the diſcourſe.

"Theſe words point out the principal object of a clergyman's duty. It is from Jeſus Chriſt, the ſupreme head of the church, that we receive our high commiſſion as ambaſſadors, and our authority. The venerable author of this epiſtle, wiſely and pionſly reſolved not to know any thing among the Corinthians, in his ſpiritual character, as the founder of their church, but Chriſt crucified. It was the great and benevolent deſign of his commiſſion to bring mankind to the knowledge and love of the Redeemer, in whom the gratitude of all hearts ſhould centre; and he was ſenſible that the moſt effectual way to attach believers to Chriſt is to ſhew forth the extent of his ſufferings, and the circumſtances of his death. In the ſame manner, we, to whom the miniſtry of reconciliation is committed, preach not ourſelves, which would be ſhocking impiety, nor the vain philoſophy of the world, which is fooliſhneſs with God; but the Lord Jeſus, who hath ſent us forth to turn men from darkneſs to light and certainty, and from the formidable power of Satan, their adverſary, to the ſure protection of the ſhepherd and biſhop of ſouls."

MISCELLANIES.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

PERSUADED that your literary Publication, amongſt other noble objects of ſuperior criticiſm, embraces the very juſt and honourable cauſe of vindicating from the malignity and miſrepreſentation of infidels, the Divine origin and true import of the Sacred Writings, I am induced to

tranſmit you, the following critique, upon a place in Cockburn's Remarks on Volney's Ruins, to be inſerted, the propriety of which I leave with you to determine.

That Volney's Ruins is a deſigned attack upon Chriſtianity, and indeed upon every other ſpecies of revealed Religion, is too palpable and notorious to need a demonſtration; and that the work has been favourably received, not only by the illiterate and abandoned, but even by the more intelligent claſs of people of this country, is a fact, which cannot, I preſume, have altogether eſcaped your obſervation. Mr. Cockburn, with a zeal and promptitude that do honour to his name, is the firſt I find, who has taken proper notice of this popular and profeſſed advocate for infidelity; and has, in my judgment, completely expoſed the ſpecioufneſs and abſurdity of his reaſoning, in many reſpects; though certainly, much is left to be done yet, before we can pronounce Volney confuted, or even caſtigated in the manner which his ſuperficial knowledge of Biblical literature, arrogance and temerity, moſt juſtly demand.

What, however, I chiefly wiſh to animadvert upon in this place, is that part of the controverſy, which turns upon the Egyptian *Oſiris*; whoſe name Mr. Volney aſſerts, is preſerved in the celebrated ſong of Moſes, when the poet, according to Mr. Volney's interpretation, is made to ſay; "the works of *Iſour* are perfect," explaining the term *Iſour*, in the ſenſe of a *Creator*, which being the ſame affixed by Plutarch, in ſome part of his works to Oſiris, Mr. Volney, therefore, concludes, that *Iſour* in this place of Moſes, muſt have been taken from the Egyptian *Oſiris*. Mr. Cockburn, after having juſtly remarked the illegality of this inference, is incautious enough, however, to admit with his antagoniſt, that the word, Iſour, ought to have been rendered by, *Creator*: and thus, at the mere ſuggeſtion of a ſuperficial French critic, our excellent verſion is moſt unjuſtly diſputed, and charged with miſ-tranſlation.

The word, צור, in the ſubſequent part of the ſame ſong of Moſes, occurs no leſs than *ſeven* times; in two of which places, it is utterly impoſſible to render it by, *Creator*: vide Deut. ch. xxxii. 13. "And he made him to ſuck honey out of the rock; and oil out of the flinty צור." Verſe 15, "And lightly eſteemed the צור of his ſalvation." The metaphor, *rock*, borrowed from nature, as indeed moſt other ſacred images are, was, with the Hebrew bards, a favourite epithet of Jehovah; employed, not only in reference to the rock of Horeb, to perpetuate the memory of that extraordinary miracle performed by Moſes, but, to repreſent the *power, ſtrength*, and *immutability* of the God, in whom they confided; than which, nothing, indeed, could be more congenial, nothing more agreeable to the genius and deſign of Hebrew poetry. Hence the royal Pſalmiſt, in his profuſion of poetic imagery, and ſublimity of language, is delighted with no epithet of the Deity, more than with צור, the *rock*. Vide, Pſ. lxii. 2. xxvii. 5. xviii. 31, &c. Neither Mr. Volney, or any other critic, can derive צור from יצר, *formavit*, as the agent of the verb, upon any known principle of etymology; on the contrary, the *noun*, formed from this verb, and which is ſometimes applied to God, in the ſenſe of, *Creator*, or *Formator*, is *Yotſer*; very different from *Iſour*, both in form and ſignification. The term, צור, comes immediately from the verb, צור, in the ſenſe of to *faſten*, or *bind*; which, according to analogy, will give צור, any thing faſtened or bound, ſo as not to be removed; for inſtance, a *rock*. To the preceeding arguments in vindication of the received tranſlation, I may add a number of the moſt reſpectable

reſpectable authorities; which, in queſtions of this nature, are of much greater importance than all the efforts of modern criticiſm put together. The Chaldee paraphraſt, in this as in other places, where the epithet occurs, retaining only the aptitude of the metaphor in the concrete, has rendered it by, תקפא, *ſtrong*, or *powerful*. The Septuagint, as we find in other inſtances, rejecting the Antonomaſia altogether, have ſubſtituted in its place the poſitive term, Θεος; which they would not have done, had they underſtood, *Iſour*, in the ſenſe of a *Creator*. Montanus, and other Latin interpreters have rendered it by, *Petra*; which is, indeed, the true ſenſe, and the only acceptation in which the word has been taken by any commentator whatever, ancient or modern, worthy of that appellation.

It is evident however, that Mr. Volney, and his antagoniſt, Mr. Cockburn, have both been drawn into this error, by a wrong conception of the ſubſequent words, פעלו התמים; which they ſeem to have underſtood of the *Works* of the *Creation*. But this miſtake, important in its kind, will afford me another opportunity of ſhewing the little credit we ought to attach to the generality of our Hebrew critics, whoſe ingenuity alone is made to ſupply the place of Biblical learning. In Hebrew, there are five words, all rendered indifferently in the common tranſlation by, *works*; which, for the better elucidation of the paſſage before us, I will briefly touch upon. Firſt עבדה, which denotes any kind of ſlaviſh work, ſuch as may be expected from a ſervant, &c. Vide, Numb. C. iv. 43. 2d. מלאכה, which implies any errand, working, buſineſs, or employment, conſidered in the abſtract. Vide, Prov. C. xxii., 29. 3d. עלילה, or מעללים, which if ſpoken of man, ſignifies his ways or habits, generally in a bad ſenſe; but, if ſaid of God, it denotes, in the Pſalmiſt particularly, theſe wonderful works which he wrought in the ſight of the Jews, during their journey through the Deſart. 4th, פעל, which, if ſpoken of man, ſignifies his moral deeds, or actions, whether good or bad, conſidered as a free agent; but, if meant of God, the operations of the Deity in the adminiſtration of the viſible and inviſible world. 5th, מעשה, which means any thing made or done, whether it may be the production of art or nature; and, when applied to God, denotes the Works of the Creation, animate or inanimate, in an univerſal ſenſe: notwithſtanding Bythna, in his Syra Prophetica, has aſſerted the contrary: for examples of which, and the two preceeding terms, vide Pſ. lxxvii. 13; lxxviii. 11; xcix. 8; ix. xvii; viii. 4; xxviii. 4, &c. In the laſt acceptation of the word works it is, that Mr. Volney appears to have taken "the works of Iſour," as he terms them, in this place of Moſes; predicting of them, that they are, *perfect*, a ſenſe at once erroneous, vague, and unintelligible. The paſſage, with its context, ought to be interpreted thus: "Aſcribe ye majeſty unto our God, a rock, whoſe adminiſtration in the government of the world is juſt and unimpeachable; for all his proceedings are impartial juſtice; a God of truth, without iniquity, juſt and upright is he." That I have given the true meaning of תמים, is apparent to every Hebrew ſcholar; but for a further confirmation, ſee Pſ. xviii. 30.

I have been the more particular in expoſing the abſurdity of this ſuggeſted emendation of the common verſion, becauſe, moſt of our Biblical critics, deſtitute of Rabbinical learning, are conſtantly pouring upon us new interpretation of Scripture, preparing alterations of the text, &c.; ſo that the ſimple reader, if he happens to ſtumble upon any of them, is perplexed and ſtaggered in his mind, and is even led to ſuſpect the fidelity of his Bible.

I am, with much eſteem, your's, &c.

J. OXLEE.

DEFENCE OF THE REV. MR. RYLAND.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

IN the number of your work for March, (P p. 305, 306,) occurs an article, upon which I feel concerned to make ſome obſervations.

It is foreign to my purpoſe to enter into any diſcuſſion of the merits of the publication to which you attract the attention of your readers. There are ſome circumſtances, however, of a leſs literary deſcription in your review, which appear to be not altogether undeſerving of notice.

You ſet out with characterizing the author of the piece in queſtion, in the following manner: "This veteran in what is called the *evangelical ſchool*, has been long known to poſſeſs the bathos above moſt of his fellows of the ſame perſuaſion." And your concluſion is in theſe words: "Such is his wide extended fame in the midland counties, that many in the courſe of his long labours, have been induced to hear and ſee him in the pulpit on account of his oddity, and the uniform report has been, that he is *a dric'lo and a ſhew.*"

Now Sir, had I met with this perſonal and illiberal attack upon a clergyman of the eſtabliſhed church, in a publication devoted to jacobinical intereſts, every thing would have appeared perfectly in character. But you muſt allow me to expreſs ſome ſurpriſe that ſuch a libel ſhould find admittance in a work. which chooſes to diſtinguiſh itſelf by profeſſing, in its very title, a determined hoſtility againſt the principles of jacobiniſm. My ſurprize would have been leſs, had the abuſive paſſages above tranſcribed been the private and unchaſtized effuſions of a correſpondent alone, but when you do not ſcruple to charge yourſelf and your work with ſo groſs and unwarranted an outrage upon every principle of juſtice and decency, I muſt ſay, that you ſeem to pay as little reſpect to the good ſenſe and moral ſentiments of your readers as you do to your own.

I will, however, relieve your ſhoulders of the burthen, and throw it upon thoſe of your reviewer; to which you will poſſibly not object. Your reviewer then is either a layman or a clergyman. If a layman, his preſumption is to be admired in thus citing before his tribunal, and paſſing ſentence of condemnation upon an eccleſiaſtic. If a clergyman, which for many reaſons is the more probable ſuppoſition, the procedure will hardly admit a more favourable repreſentation. Whether the ſtyle adopted by the writer imply perſonal knowledge, and in that caſe, perſonal enmity, is left with others, with better means of information, to decide. But it becomes your clerical reviewer, if ſuch, to determine, by what conſiderations of religion or morality he is juſtified in viliſying the character, and impeding the profeſſional influence, of a brother, againſt whom the antipathy which he expreſſes appears to be excited by nothing either erroneous in doctrine, or reprehenſible in life.

I will not pretend to diſpute the alleged fact reſpecting thoſe friends of your reviewer, who, occaſionally withdrawing themſelves from their own pariſh churches, have viſited that of the divine attacked in your pages, for the laudable purpoſe of converting a religious ordinance into an occaſion of diverſion. I have as little reaſon to queſtion, that perſons ſo favourably diſpoſed have ſucceeded in the object of their expeditions. But in juſtice

to

to an injured character, I beg to expreſs my firm and deliberate conviction, a conviction for which I have at leaſt as much ground as your reviewer for any of a contrary deſcription, that in integrity and benevolence, in devotedneſs to God, and a conſcientious dicharge of the ſacred and reſponſible duties of the miniſtry, the Rector of Sutton Coldfield has not his ſuperior in the whole extent of the united kingdom. And in this teſtimony I know that the greater part of his pariſhioners if neceſſary, would willingly and even zealouſly concur. I believe the man does not exiſt, who is acquainted with Mr. R. and does not in his heart reſpect him. In ſhort, were I diſpoſed to qualify the praiſe due to him, I could find no words better ſuited to expreſs the entire of his character, than the honeſt boaſt of the primitive Chriſtians—*Non eloquimur magna, ſed vivimus.* Yet this is the perſon, Sir, whom your reviewer is not aſhamed to hold up to public ſcorn; to ſtigmatize with contemptuous acrimony as *a veteran in the evangelical ſchool*, and ſtill more opprobrioufly to villify as a *driv'ler and a ſhew*. Is this language to be uſed towards a divine of the church of England? Is this language by which the Anti-Jacobin] reviewer hopes, either to recommend his own principles, or to promote the intereſts of the national religion? Is it language to be tolerated?

Had the gentleman who is the object of your reviewer's invective, undertaken the defence of ſtage entertainments, and pronounced the theatre a ſchool of virtue; or vindicated the vices of youth, as being with ingenuous minds their own remedy; or charged the articles of the church as inclining to enthuſiaſm; or attacked, not only what is, but what is called enthuſiaſm, with an undiſtinguiſhing and ferocious vehemence, which ſpares not, and ſeems intended not to ſpare, religion itſelf; or deſpoiled Chriſtianity of her peculiar and fundamental doctrine, by the help of a "key," or picklock, ſupplied by the kind hand of nonconformity to the diſtreſſed heterodoxy of ſome of the ſons of the eſtabliſhment;—a portion of ſeverity greater than uſual in your reviewer would have admitted a very reaſonable apology, but poſſibly your reviewer would not have felt diſpoſed to exerciſe any ſeverity at all.

Upon the whole, Sir, the only alternative, by way of reparation, in the power of your reviewer ſeems to be, either to acknowledge his offence and retract his calumny, or, by diſcovering himſelf to the public, to enable them to determine, whether the pre-eminence of his character be ſuch, as to juſtify him in aſſuming the office which he has thought fit to exerciſe, and to exempt him from thoſe obligations of decency and equity, which are generally conſidered as binding upon ordinary writers.

I am, Sir,

Your ſincere well wiſher,

Sutton Coldfield, May 8, 1805. A PARISHIONER.

P.S. I beg that you will inſert this letter, *without any interpolations*, in your Miſcellany; and ſhall expect either its appearance, or ſuch notice of your intention concerning it, in your number for this month, as will decide my future meaſures.

TO

TO THE EDITOR.

Nil mihi reſpondes? aut dic, aut accipe elcem.
Ede, ubi conſiſtas: in quâ te quæro proſeuchâ?
Dicere, ſi tentes aliquid, taciturna recedas,
Tatundem eſt feriunt pariter: vadimonia deindè
Irati faciunt.—Iuv.

SIR,

THE very early attention beſtowed on Mr. Ryland's "Sermon to Farmers," naturally induces a ſuſpicion that your Reviewer, on ſome account or other, deemed it of importance. I accordingly expected that we ſhould be preſented with a fair account of its contents, accompanied by ſuch comments as, in your critic's opinion, might enable the public to form a juſt eſtimate of its character. Here, however, I was miſtaken. He has, indeed, favoured your readers with a few detached ſentences, ſelected, no doubt, for the ſpecial purpoſe of conciliating their attention to the reſt, and tied together with ſuch critical dexterity, as cannot fail to produce a favourable impreſſion, with reſpect to its general merits as a compoſition. It is not my intention to enter at all into the literary talents of Mr. *R*——, I neither undertake to vindicate nor to condemn his peculiarities of ſtyle or manner, as a preacher or writer; nor, in dealing with your critic, is it even neceſſary, that I ſhould offer any farther opinion on the ſermon in queſtion. This, however, I will venture to ſay in its behalf, that no candid man who reads the diſcourſe, can for a moment heſitate as to the *motive* of the writer; nor is there any man whatever who has had any opportunity of witneſſing his unwearied exertions as a parochial miniſter, that will refuſe to Mr. R. the credit of doing his beſt for the ſpiritual advantage of the pariſh.

I feel as anxious, Mr. Editor, as your Reviewer can do, that nothing ſhould be offered to the public, and eſpecially by clergymen, that is not well meditated and correctly compoſed; but ſurely, Sir, ſomething is to be allowed for the circle in which a man happens to labour, and the claſs of perſons for whoſe immediate inſtruction he undertakes to write. But, after all, *non omnes omnia*. Your critic, Sir, in his future mid-land inſpections, may perchance find ſome other writers, who would not be thought of the evangelical ſchool, but are veterans of another claſs, who may alſo have *their* literary ſins to repent of. I could eaſily aſſiſt the worthy gentleman's memory, but a reference to a ſhilling pamphlet, publiſhed ſome years ago in this country, and to the epiſtles of a certain correſpondent of yours within the laſt year, will abundantly ſupercede the neceſſity of my ſervices. All I deſire is that your Reviewer may be impartial; and if, in his ſcrutiny, he ſhould detect any of his mid-land brethren, who in an evil hour have put out *thoughts*, &c. crude and ill-deviſed, epiſtles conſtructed of the ends, parings, and ſcraps of obſolete ſlander; he will, I truſt, have the conſolation to find, that theſe erring brethren have repented of their deeds, and, as their beſt atonement, are following Mr. R.'s example, by employing ſuch talents as they poſſeſs for the good of their people.

But, Sir, had your critic confined himſelf to his proper department as a judge of literary merit, whatever might have been my opinion of his verdict, it might for me have paſſed (as I believe it will do) into ſpeedy oblivion.

vion. He does not, however, content himſelf with playing the critic—it is pretty evident he had another, and a far leſs honourable game to play—his object was the *man*, and not the ſermon.

Sir, I do not deny that on ſome occaſions, the character of a writer, whether good or bad, may be fairly and advantageouſly mixed with a critique on his work; but this, I apprehend, can only be, where the known moral excellence of the man is calculated to give effect to ſound principles, or, where character of an oppoſite kind may be produced as an antidote to opinions of another deſcription.

It is true, your critic makes no *direct* attack on the ſoundneſs of Mr. R.'s principles, nor on the integrity of his moral character; and for this I give him no kind of credit, as he muſt be perfectly aware that both are above his *juſt* animadverſion. But he *would* make the good man ridiculous.

Ridicule, Mr. Editor, is a dangerous weapon—in ſome hands it is apt to recoil. It has been employed as the teſt of truth; but in the preſent inſtance, and as far as your Reviewer is concerned, I greatly ſuſpect it will turn out to be a teſt of ſomething elſe. It ſeems, according to him, that Mr. R. attracts by his *oddity* in the pulpit. It is certainly, Sir, very true, that for a long courſe of years great numbers of people have been induced to hear this gentleman, and it is poſſible that a certain characteriſtic peculiarity of manner may have contributed ſomething as an attraction; but what then? This circumſtance in itſelf determines nothing as to the goodneſs or badneſs of his preaching; it only proves that his oddity, whatever it be, happens to be *a popular* one. Now, Sir, it is very well known, that there are certain other mid-land divines, who have alſo their pulpit oddities, but it is whiſpered, that, in ſome inſtances, they happen to be repulſive oddities and not popular; and perhaps, Mr. Editor, *hinc illæ lachrymæ!*

But no matter, peculiarities or oddities, call them what you will, that are characteriſtic and not affected, are in the huff: no man is ſtrictly anſwerable for them, more than for any ſingularities of figure, voice, or aſpect. If, indeed, the mumbler will ſet up for a Demoſthenes, or the hump-back for an Adonis, the poor gentleman will be laughed at, and there is no help for it. But, if he endeavour to correct his peculiarities, or, as far as they will admit of it, to turn them to good account, he has done his beſt; after this, they may poſſibly (when very prominent) provoke the good man's ſmile, but they will never ſeriouſly incur his *ridicule*.

But as your Reviewer conſidered the perſonal hiſtory of Mr. R. of ſome intereſt, it may not perhaps be ungrateful to your readers to be made a little better acquainted with this *odd* gentleman. There are ſome other particulars in his character, which I truſt, will not, upon inveſtigation and compariſon be found *oddities*, and, of ſuch general notoriety in this neighbourhood, that I am aſtoniſhed they ſhould have eſcaped your midland critic.

For example, Sir, one thing for which he has been notorious for nearly half a century, is his unwearied attention to his various duties as a parochial miniſter. Another, which I am afraid will be deemed an oddity, is, that, during the greater part of his long profeſſional life, he has never been found drivelling in the ball-room, nor heightening the pleaſures of the feſtive board by the luſcious joke, nor ſanctioning, by his preſence or his pen, what you, Sir, if I recollect right, deem the pernicious amuſements of the theatre. A third of this gentleman's oddities, and for which I hope

your

your critic will forgive him (especially if he should chance to be himself a pluralist and non-resident) is, that on his succeeding to his present rectory, he divided the whole income of his chapel in Birmingham between his two assistants:—and, what of course will appear an odd consequence from the whole is, that with all these oddities in the pulpit and out of it, there is but one sentiment amongst all who know the man, and are capable of estimating his real character; it is this, Sir, and I submit it for the revision of your critic; that if native simplicity, unaffected piety, and unblemished purity of morals, constitute excellence; these qualities combine, and in an eminent degree, in the character of John Ryland.

Whether, Mr. Editor, the contemptuous, the opprobrious and ungentlemanly epithets of a DREVELLER AND A SHEW should be applied to such a man, and in a work of such consideration as your own, I must leave to your justice to decide! Your Reviewer has applied them to Mr. Ryland, but upon what authority is best known to himself. I hope, for his own sake, the gentleman lives at a distance, and may have been misled by some solitary babbler; if he be a near observer, and has kept good company, there is no excuse for him.

I beg pardon, Sir, for trespassing so long on your patience, but I am offering my honest suffrage to the character of a man highly respectable for station, venerable for years, and more eminent for virtue. I cannot consent that such a man should be the object of anonymous invective, without endeavouring to repel the slander. I think this due, Sir, not only to Mr. R, but to yourself, to the clerical profession, and to the public. This is not a time for sinking the clerical character, and I persuade myself I shall be supported by you in this opinion. If men are endeavouring according to their abilities to do God service, though with great disparity of talent; if exertion in their different stations be combined with integrity, and regulated by a strict regard to the discipline of our church—and, if their Diocesans find nothing to censure; surely it is rather too much for their brethren and equals, to whom the church has vouchsafed no such authority, to erect themselves into censors, and to employ against a part of their body the same weapons of ridicule and invective, which avowed enemies have sometimes wielded, against the whole clergy of England!

I remember some observations on this subject, made by one of the ablest dissenters in the kingdom, which I think worthy to be recorded to the honour of his superior candour and sense, and as a caution to those whom it may concern. He regretted in conversation that a certain dissenting minister had in his discourses, addressed to the villages in his neighbourhood, mingled a great deal of ridicule and censure against the clergy, and that the effect had been, that the clerical order throughout the district was visibly lowered in the opinion of the people. He lamented this, because the common people in general make little or no distinction between religion itself and the character of its ministers. If they are taught to despise the one, they will by an easy gradation fall into a contempt for the other. And this, Sir, is the very game that infidelity and jacobinism have been playing in our own time. This distinguished Dissenter saw the evil, and, with a noble regard for Christianity, that does not confine its interests to a sect, deprecated the mischiefs done to its character, by the ridicule and contempt thrown on the established clergy. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*

Your Reviewer may be a sincere friend to the Church of England, but unless his zeal be in general exercised with more discrimination, I am persuaded

ſuaded he is a very injudicious one. He is not aware while thus reviling his brethren, that infidelity ſtands by and enjoys the joke, and that thoſe who are ſyſtematically hoſtile to the Church, are obliged to him for doing their work, and anticipate ample ſpoils from our internal diviſions. I ſpeak as a clergyman of the Church of England, and in no other character am I, nor will I be known. If there be a party in this Church hoſtile to her doctrines or diſcipline, in the name of common juſtice! let our lawful rulers deal with them according to the powers they poſſeſs for that purpoſe; but let not a juriſdiction without the Church be attempted to be impoſed, that ſhall firſt imagine crimes, then arbitrarily ſelect and denounce its victims, and, with an inquiſitorial rigour, hurt its anathemas, and inflict its tortures.

Sir, to the beſt of my knowledge and belief, no ſuch party exiſts at the preſent moment; if, in my conſcience I thought otherwiſe, I ſhould be ready to go all lengths with you, (that the temper of our religion will warrant) in detecting and expoſing it before the proper tribunal; but you will permit me to ſay, the illiberal and ſhort-ſighted policy, betrayed by ſuch men as your Reviewer, is calculated to create a party. If the moſt zealous abettors of non-conformity were to ſit in council, and to form an inſtitution for propagating diſſent in the boſom of our Church, they could not well have hit upon a better expedient.

For if men are to be eternally goaded by the imputation of principles, of connections and motives which they diſavow, are to be held up to their ſuperiors and the public, as *marked men, fanatics*, a *ſet* and *faction* in the Church; if, in whatever they ſay or publiſh for the benefit of their people, they are to be purſued and hunted down in this way; if neither age, ſituation, nor unblemiſhed integrity can protect them from being gibbetted in the Anti-Jacobin Review as *Drivellers and Shews*;—whatever be the ſatisfaction afforded by the teſtimony of conſcience and of their people, it is undeniable, Sir, that the natural (I will not ſay, *intended)* operation of ſuch treatment is to weaken their attachment to a community, when they feel themſelves, in a ſenſe, *proſcribed* and *put out of the law*—where the common confidence, and, in ſome inſtances too, the common civilities of their brethren are denied them!

I am Sir,

Your's reſpectfully,

May 8th, 1805. A WARWICKSHIRE CLERGYMAN.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

IN conſequence of the horrors introduced into the infatuated kingdom of France, by what Voltaire would call the two *charming* principles of *Liberty* and *Philoſophy*, an emigrant prieſt, who had been miniſter of the principal Church of Rouen, happened to be caſt into my neighbourhood. He was a bigot, had much of the propaganda ſpirit, and appeared to have read very little but the decrees of Popes and Councils; yet he ſeemed mild and gentle, and I can hardly form an idea that, had he been in Ireland, he would have joined in exciting the papiſts to murder the heretics. Yet the papiſts themſelves declare, and I apprehend too truly, that their religion is unchanged and unchangeable; however, I had ſome opportunities

portunities of ſhewing him, that my religion was unchanged and unchangeable, by giving him ſome roaſt beef and pudding. In return, he put into my hand two little pamphlets in Latin, which every Romiſh prieſt, I ſuppoſe, poſſeſſes, but ſuch as are conſcious of the weakneſs of their cauſe, would be ſhy of producing them. I do not recollect the titles, but the firſt, I think, was an addreſs of the French Biſhops to the late Pope Pius VI, requeſting advice in their difficulties; and the Pope's anſwer. The ſecond was a kind of manifeſto of the new Pope, and a circular letter from his Prime Miniſter announcing his acceſſion. I cannot now remember the particulars, but I ſent him the following obſervations, which, if you approve of them, are at your ſervice.

INCOGNITUS.

DEAR SIR, Nov. 3, 1800.

"I have peruſed your pamphlets, and I hope you will allow me the freedom of pointing out a few of the expreſſions which appear to me moſt exceptionable in them.

"In the firſt place you are not, I am ſure, aware that the circumſtance of the Pope's conſtantly and univerſally publiſhing his inſtruments and decrees in Latin, has given the learned an opportunity of applying to him the number of the beaſt, for the letters in the word Λατεινος from the number 666, and alſo in Romiith * which means the ſame in Hebrew. Alſo the numerals in his aſſumed title "Vicarius generalis Dei in terris" amount to the ſame number; ſo that it is very remarkable that, ſuppoſing the Pope to be Anti-Chriſt, as we think he is, then his title, like that of our Lord, is written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin.

"The letter from your Biſhops is elegantly expreſſed, and the Pontiff they addreſs was, I believe, a reſpectable character, eſpecially when under oppreſſion and perſecution; but ſurely they were imprudent in laviſhing ſuch extravagant and unbounded praiſes, as they do in p. 4, on all former Popes. I am not much read in the hiſtory of the Popes, but I cannot but know that ſeveral of them were monſters of ambition, cruelty, luſt, or even infidelity. Not to mention the ignorance of ſome of them, as we may inſtance in the infallible Pope Innocent VI. who thought Petrarch a magician and a ſorcerer, "becauſe he loved to be alone, and read Virgil." Petrarch, therefore, declined writing on his holineſs, "becauſe," ſays he, "I feared I might infect him with my ſorceries, or he me with his credulity."† But what ſhall we ſay of Alexander VI. who was not only a diſgrace to the papacy, but to human nature itſelf? Or of Leo. X. who ſaid to Bellermine amidſt his cardinals, "Quantas divitias nobis peperit hæa fabula Jeſu Chriſti." This cannot be read without horror! However this man's avarice and rapacity, in making the moſt of what he blaſphemouſly ſtiled *fabula*, was the cauſe, under Providence, of the Reformations. As you are in courſe fond of Latin, I will ſubjoin a ſtory of one of your Popes (ſuppoſed to be Julius III.) as related by one of

---

* See Newton on the Prophecies. Vol III. p. 230, &c.

† See Life of Petrarch.—Some Popes could hardly read the Scriptures. Such an one was John XXIV. See Land's Conf. with a Jeſuit. p. 387.

our

our learned writers.* " Cum pavonem menſæ afferri non videret, quem ex heſternâ cænâ reliquarat, ſtatim horrendum in modum imprecari, & ſtomachari, & debacchari in famulos ſuos cæpit. Cumque unus e Cardinalibus convivis placide moneret, ne ob rem tantillam tam immodice iraſceretur; quid? inquit, nonne ego ob pavonem meum merito ſuccenſerem, cum Deus ob eſum pomi, rei ordeo leviculæ,——' pudet me catera attexere, certe animus meminiſſe horret, pigetque me infandam hanc blaſphemium ulterius proſequi. Nempe hic erat Deus in terris! imo potius *Epicuri de grege porcus;* cui Deus venter, templum culina, coci ſacerdotes!"

I could make obſervations without end, but will be as brief as poſſible. It is no wonder to hear the French Biſhops and the Pope bedaubing each other with compliments, but when the former addreſs the latter with " Beatiſſime Pater,—in quo virtutum omnium ſacer comitatus cœheſte quoddam & divinum ſpirabent." we are aſtoniſhed that any one could endure ſuch fulſome language; and eſpecially when we recollect who it was that ſaid " he that exalteth himſelf ſhall be abaſed," an abaſement which, in this caſe, ſeems to be taking place very faſt.

But this is not the worſt by a great deal. Turning to your other pamphlet I find the preſent Pope, at p. 8, thus expreſſing himſelf, " Chriſti ipſius, qui Nobis (with a great N) ſemper adeſt, nec a *noſtro* unquam *Eatere* diſcedit." Thus the Saviour of the world, we ſee, ſits not ſo much at the right hand of God, as at the right hand of the Pope, unleſs he be ſuppoſed to be always at both. But is not this plainly arrogating a ſuperiority in the pretended Vicar over the Divine Being, by whom he boaſts to have been delegated?† Surely " a mouth" is here given " ſpeaking great things and blaſphemies." But even this is not the worſt; for in your laſt piece, the Circular Letter of the Romiſh prime miniſter, he ſpeaks of the new Pope in the following moſt extraordinary terms, " ſanctiſſimi hujus, nobis *afflatu Divini Spiritûs dati*, Pontificis Opt. Max. P. *VII.* !!!" But what muſt ſtill encrea e our aſtoniſhment and horror is, that in the very next page we have, " Deus O. M." ſo that only the very ſame greateſt of all epithets is applied both to the Deity and to the Pope, but even in a more conſpicuous and emphatical manner to the latter than to the former, for the Pope is boldly and ſtrikingly entitled *Opt. Max.* while God Almighty himſelf is more faintly and obſcurely denominated *O. M.* One would have thought it almoſt impoſſible to have met with ſo literal a verification of that prophecy of the man of ſin, that he " ſhould exalt himſelf above all that is called God, or that is worſhipped." (2 Theſſ. ii. 4.) Of theſe things we ought to make the proper uſe, and the proper uſe is, to

---

* Duport in Theophraſt. Edit. Needham. Edit. P. 339.

† The abaſement of the Pope, in conſequence of ſuch arrogance, ſeems to be now almoſt compleat. This beatiſſimus Pater," is now become " miſerrimus Pater," and he might be pitied, were not his party ſtill formidable in Ireland. If the poor old man be himſelf now ſeated, not ſo much at the right hand, as at the foot-ſtool of Bonaparte, what place, we may aſk him, is now aſſigned to Him whom he ſo blaſphemouſly claims as his conſtant attendant—" et latere ſuo nunquam diſcedit"?—Certe pudet, pigetaque me, as Duport ſays, tantam blaſphemiam ulterius proſequi.

adore

adore the Divine Wiſdom of that Holy Spirit who could foretel ſo many ages ago, that ſuch a Power would ariſe," having on his ſeven heads the name of blaſpemy." (Rev. xiii. 1.) "If any man have an ear let him hear." (v. 9.)

I am obliged to you for the peruſal of the papers, which I ſuſpect that others leſs candid, and more deſigning, would have concealed. I ſhall conclude with ſincerely hoping that the preſent baniſhment of you and your brethren has been ordaind by an all-wiſe Providence, to give you all an opportunity of ſeeing with your own eyes, and hearing with your own ears; that you may no longer follow "the cunningly-deviſed fables" of popery, nor perſiſt in calumniating the profeſſors of true and genuine Chriſtianity under the name of Heretics." ‡

I am, Dear Sir, &c.

POETRY.

EPIGRAMS.

The Mighty Fallen.

WHEN the Pope weakly quitted his Anti-Chriſt city,
He loſt, at one ſtroke, both his pow'r, and our pity.
Now the ſlave of a Turk he's no longer "his holineſs;"
But in place, tho' by no means in ſpirit, "his lowlineſs."

The Foxes.

John Fox deſcribed, for pure religion's ſake,
How Martyrs died triumphant at the ſtake,
Charles thinks the papiſts' lot we ſhould deplore,
That now ſuch bonfires they can light no more!

Times Changed.

"The Pope and the Devil," we formerly ſung,
When Engliſhmen's hearts in their right places hung:
But the Papiſts we now to our Senate muſt bring,
For they honour and love a d—d heretic King.

TOM T'WHIG'EM.

---

‡ This, however, did not prove to be the caſe, which may ſuggeſt to us, that Providence works by means far above our comprehenſion, and very different from the moſt probable human conjectures.